NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

VOLUME 1. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1840. NUMBER 7.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 143 NASSAU STREET.

NATHANIEL P. ROGERS, Editor.

TERMS.—Two Dollars a year, in advance.

Three Dollars if delayed until the end of the year.

Ten Dollars, in advance, will pay for 7 copies one year, sent to one address.

Twenty-Five Dollars a year, in advance, will pay for twenty copies one year, sent to one address.

WILLIAM S. DORR, Printer.

Address of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

To the Friends of the Anti-Slavery Cause throughout the United States and the World.

The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was organized in the city of New-York, by about three hundred members of the American Anti-Slavery Society, on the 15th of May, 1840. Many of you are familiar with the history of the *peculiar difficulties* which have embarrassed the Anti-Slavery cause in the State of Massachusetts during the last two years; and the *efforts* which were made, a year ago, in the business meetings of the American Society in this city, to procure the sanction of that institution to the new sectarian views, with respect to the part which it was assumed that females had a right to take in those meetings. Though those efforts were partly successful at the anniversary meeting in 1839, it was nevertheless hoped, that time would relieve the cause of the down-trodden slave of this extraneous burden, and convince those who had introduced this difficulty into our meetings, of the great injury which it must inevitably inflict on the cause we all profess to love. Our confidence in the integrity of those who had engaged with us in the momentous struggle against slavery, led us to hope, that whatever might be the *private* opinions of individuals, as to the *inherent sinfulness* of human government, and the sphere in which females ought to act, yet, that the American Society could never be identified with these views, or that its official sanction could, by any means, be obtained to principles so evidently foreign to any thing contemplated, or set forth in its Constitution. And, especially, as these new views were confined principally within the limits of the single State of Massachusetts, many were not prepared to believe, that their advocates could possibly gain a sufficient number in our ranks, to carry the National Society in their favor, even should they be disposed to do so. That they should have done so, at the late annual meeting in this city, is to be accounted for by the fact, that the National Society is not a representative body. Hence it will be easily seen, that a *party* in such a society, having any peculiar object to gain, could command every desirable facility for carrying their purpose, however foreign it might be to the original design and practice of those who originated the American Anti-Slavery Society.

It is well known, that the Convention which formed that Association, was composed of men only, and that it was not, at first, a mixed society of men and women. And it is equally well known, that it was then designed and understood, that its business should be conducted by men as is *usual in the other benevolent societies of the age*; while, at the same time, it was expected and desired, that females should form auxiliaries, in the usual way, to the parent institution. And this interpretation of the constitution, and the consequent practice, continued for six years, up to the Annual Meeting in 1839, without the least interruption.—Hence, it is evident, that those of our numbers who have recently assumed to bring females into the business meetings to vote and speak, and also, that they should be appointed *officers* of the Society, as they were at the late Annual Meeting, are responsible for the difficulty which has produced division in this Society. It is true, the fourth article of the Constitution says that "any person," who consents to its principles, &c., may become a member of the Society, and be entitled to vote at its meetings. But, that this provision was not designed to signify anything more than is implied in similar provisions in the constitutions of the other benevolent societies of the day, is *proved*.

1. From the understanding of those who took part in forming the Society in 1833. No one then assumed, that the word "person," was to be understood out of the common way of interpreting constitutions.

2. From the *uniform practice* of the American Anti-Slavery Society, for six years, from the time when it was organized.

3. From the manifest absurdity of the contrary doctrine. For, if the word "person," in the Constitution, is to have the indiscriminate application contended for, then it must, of course, include not only women, but *children* also, thousands of whom have been in the habit of contributing to the funds of the Society.

It would, perhaps, be a sufficient refutation of this *new* interpretation of the word "person," in the Constitution, to know, that at the convention in 1833, which formed the Society, two or three women, members of the Society of Friends, were present, with other female spectators, and asked *permission* to offer a few remarks, and leave was accordingly granted. Agreeably to the recommendation of that Convention, separate female societies were extensively formed; thus proving, that no one originally claimed it as a right, that females should debate in the public meetings, and much less that they should be appointed officers of the Society. And yet, in view of all these well known facts, at the recent meeting of the Society, the acting President nominated a woman on the business committee, associated with eleven men. On a division of the house on the question of her appointment, it appeared that 1008 members were present and voted, (of whom *four hundred and sixty-four* were from the single state of Massachusetts!) 557 voted in her favor, and 451 in the negative, being a majority of 106 in her favor. Had the men only voted in this case, the decision would have been reversed. This was considered a test vote of the relative strength of the "woman's rights," and constitutional parties, assembled; and it was believed, that the act of placing a woman on the business committee, was merely an initiatory step to the introduction of other measures, FOREIGN to the original principles and designs of the anti-slavery enterprise, all tending to divert the minds of abolitionists from the cause of the slave, and the rights of the free people of color. It was thought, that it would be in vain to attempt a reversal of this decision or to expect a change for the better; that meetings thus constituted would not consent to alterations of the Constitution defining the word "person" to mean men, or to substitute a representative system for the usual collection of members in a disproportionate number from one locality, thus leaving the door open (as was done this year) for a packed delegation; that persons of such different moral affinities could not, advantageously, labor together; and that Providence seemed to indicate that it was a duty, for peace sake, as well as for other considerations, to separate from those who seemed to be rendering the anti-slavery cause an object of dislike to a large number of influential and excellent citizens. Several men, nominated to serve on the business committee, immediately declined serving, in consequence of the act of the majority, and others afterwards withdrew. They stated, that the innovation seemed to them repugnant to the constitution of the Society—that it was throwing a fire-brand into anti-slavery meetings—that it was contrary to the usages of the civilized world—and that it tended to destroy the efficiency of female anti-slavery action.

But the question of "woman's rights," is not the only matter of difference between the adherents to the old society, and the friends of the new association; nor is it the chief cause of the difficulty, though it happened to come up first and prominently at the late annual meeting. At the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the lawfulness of human government was recognized, and it was a fundamental principle, that political action was both expedient and proper. Recently, however the same persons belonging to the Anti-Slavery ranks, who are contending for what they call "woman's rights"—the civil and political equality of women with men—deny the obligation of forming, supporting, or yielding obedience to civil government, and refuse to affirm the *duty* of political action; and they contrived to bring to the late annual meeting of the Society a sufficient number of men and *women*, to compose a majority of all the members present, to sustain their views and measures. Styling themselves "non-resistants," and professing to be opposed to all physical force, either of offence or defence, but not disclaiming in theory or practice, the use of the tongue and pen as weapons—weapons that often inflict wounds as really as any other weapons could do—with which to assail those who are for maintaining the primitive objects of the Society, they seem determined to carry forward their favorite theories and practices, at all events, even if the great moral enterprise in which they and we originally embarked, should retrograde, and be justly offensive to those who might otherwise join the Anti-Slavery ranks, and help on the cause of impartial liberty to a glorious consummation. We wish for the support of every good man, and we wish all to understand distinctly, that it will be no part of our design to break up existing organizations in church or state, but only to wake up and give impetus to the usual forms of social action; and one special object will be, by light and love, to secure appropriate church action in the several religious connexions. With regard to political action, while we recognise the rightfulness of government, and shall urge political action as a duty, we shall not go *as a society* with the machinery of party political arrangements, but leave that for the action of individual citizens. Neither shall we denounce these as recreants who may differ from us in regard to the *best mode* of such action. It will also be our endeavor to promote the "equal security, protection and improvement of the people of color," a duty that has been greatly neglected—to which we have not sufficiently attended—and which should be a leading object with every Anti-Slavery Association.

On the evening of May 13th, a preliminary meeting was held of some of those who were dissatisfied with the recent action of the American Anti-Slavery Society, to consider the subject of forming a new association, as reconciliation, or a change of policy, or a suitable amendment of the Constitution, appeared to be impracticable. And after prayerful consideration, it was unanimously resolved that it is best to separate from the old Society, and to organize a new association on the same great fundamental principles, with enlarged objects—and for this purpose to call a meeting of those who voted in the minority. On the next day a general meeting was notified, and numerously attended. About three hundred members of the American Anti-Slavery Society enrolled their names, and organized a Convention, which held its session during three days. A draft of a constitution was reported by a committee, its provisions fully discussed, and the same was finally adopted with great unanimity. Officers were then chosen. This Constitution is now submitted to the Abolitionists of the United States, and of the world, in the hope that individuals will become members, and auxiliary societies will be formed in towns, counties, and States. It will be seen that the Constitution contemplates enlarged action with reference to the Slave trade, and especially co-ordinate action with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. This was a prominent motive in assuming the designation of the new Society. We wish to embrace within our operations the cause of the enslaved throughout the world, and to co-operate with our brethren in Great Britain, France, &c., in wise and judicious plans for the abolition of the Slave-trade, and *the system that produces it*.

Donations, for general or specific objects, are earnestly solicited, and can be sent by mail or otherwise, directed to Lewis Tappan, Treasurer, at 131 Nassau, or 122 Pearl-street.

Let it not be imagined that the Society has any desire to wage war upon any other association. Far from it. It has been a source of grief to the true friends of the slave—and of exultation to the enemies of human rights—to see a denunciatory spirit towards brethren engaged in the sublime cause of emancipation, and to witness those who formerly endured unjustly so much reproach together—estranged or hostile. But our objects, being simply the peaceful deliverance of the slave and the restoration of our fellow-citizens of color to *the same* rights and privileges with the rest of the community, do not require the adoption of any such policy. An enforced uniformity of action, a subjugation of the wide spread Anti-Slavery hosts to the decrees of one central power, a necessity to follow the footsteps of any earthly leader, or to spend our breath in glorifying any man of like passions with ourselves, form no part of our plan of operations. So far as our own conduct can influence the future, the two divisions of the Anti-Slavery body will henceforth plead the cause of the slave, without criminating or recriminating each other, both will labor for the speedy and peaceful triumph of humanity and freedom; and God, and not man, will receive all the glory of the universal triumph of liberty. Should this, happily, be the case, all concerned may hereafter look back upon the circumstances that brought about a separation, with devout gratitude, as an occurrence that accelerated the progress of the cause. Let the eyes of all be directed to those great systems of iniquity for the extinction of which we have associated together, beseeching the God of all grace to smile upon our efforts, and crown them with His blessing. Such was the spirit of the Convention that originated the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

In conclusion, the Committee recommend the observance of the Monthly Concert of Prayer, for the enslaved and free people of color, on the last Monday evening of every month, the practice of remembering the slave, and the victims of caste, in the closet, at the family altar, in the social circle, and in the sanctuaries of the Most High. They urge upon abolitionists throughout the land to organise themselves into efficient auxiliary societies, to form Anti-Slavery Depositories, to scatter Anti-Slavery publications, to collect and transmit funds to the treasury, and, in a spirit of Christian boldness, tenderness, and fidelity, to arouse the conscience and sympathy of the people on behalf of their down-trodden and insulted fellow-men. The committee earnestly request the prayers of Christian abolitionists, that they may have wisdom from above, profitable to direct, and they invite all their fellow-citizens who pity the enslaved, who desire to promote the best interests of the slave-holder, who love their country, who respect the rights of man, and reverence the law of God, to unite with the Society in the great work of bringing about the extinction of the slave trade, and slavery, in this land and throughout the world.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, *President*.
S. W. BENEDICT, *Recording Secretary*.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Address of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to the Abolitionists of the United States.

In laying the following statement before our brethren, we obey an instruction of the Society we represent, and the dictates of our own judgment. There are moments in human history, which are embryo ages. Of such a moment we have to speak, in relation to the future fortunes of Anti-Slavery enterprise in this country. It is fit, then, that the fullest communication be had, and the maturest counsels adopted at this stage of our affairs.

The occasion embraced by a considerable minority, of retiring from our ranks at the late Annual Meeting, and forming a separate National Anti-Slavery Society, was the appointment of a woman, a member of the Society, and a delegate to that meeting, on the Business Committee. No objection was made to the votes of women, nor to their performance of other duties and their exercise of other rights of membership. They might create a committee, instruct it, sanction or reject its report, recommit, amend or propose and adopt a substitute; in a word, they might, by the admission of the minority, be the masters, but in no case the servants of the Society; for it is a principle of parliamentary law, that a committee is a mere servant of the House. And if the Society should choose to resolve itself into a committee of the whole, for the sake of convenience and freedom of debate, women, according to this view, should be turned out of their seats and go home, or retire, as strangers, to the gallery until the *Committee* should rise, and then they would reclaim their lost seats, and sit in judgment on the doings of the men. But it would be tedious, if not trifling, to run this notion into all its legitimate absurdities.

Against the abovementioned appointment, the disaffected made a firm stand; and being defeated by a decisive majority, they withdrew and entered into "new organization."

Surely this is narrow ground for a National Association to found itself upon. Had they objected to the recognition of women as *members*, or to their exercising any of the rights, or performing any duty appertaining to membership, they would have been less inconsistent though not less incorrect. So far, however, from opposing their voting, the separatists repeatedly pressed them in open meeting so to do, provided they would vote on *their side*. Thus they practically contradicted all that they had said about the impropriety of women's acting "in mixed meetings," its repugnance to the Constitution and to the precept of the Apostle Paul.

But as this was the immediate ground of summoning the Convention to form the "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society," it is proper to state all the reasons assigned to sustain it. They were:

1. That the appointment of a woman on a committee was contrary to the Constitution of the Society, inasmuch as the word "person" in that instrument signified men only; that this was the usual way of construing it in such connection, and that it had been uniformly so understood in this Society.

2. That it was throwing a firebrand into the Society.

3. That it was contrary to the usages of the civilized world.

4. That it was unscriptural.

To these objections it was replied—

1. The 4th article of the Constitution has determined the qualifications for membership in the words following, to wit:

"Any *person* who consents to the principles of the Constitution, who contributes to the funds of the Society, and is not a slaveholder, may be a member of the Society, and shall be entitled to vote at its meetings."

Under this article women have become members. It was now proposed to divest them of the rights and privileges they had acquired by consenting to the principles of the Constitution, and contributing to the funds of the Society. And this upon the bare assertion, that the term "person," as here used, meant men and excluded women. Not an instance of such limitation of the term, on an actual claim of a woman to enjoy the rights of a member in a society to which she belonged, was adduced. Reference was only made to what benevolent societies have done, or rather have not done, when no such case was before them. As soon as the question arose in our Society, it was decided against those, who now appealed to precedent.

The member who took the lead in making this objection, afterwards called the Convention for forming the new Society, and acted as President of it. In answer to him, it was observed that he had adduced no particular instance to support his proposition, but he had been very active and ingenious in devising ways of rescuing runaway slaves from the pursuit of their masters. The Constitution of the United States provides that a "*person* held to labor or service in one State, escaping into another, shall be delivered up on the claim of the party to whom such service or labor is due" Now, did it ever occur to him to resist the surrender of a female fugitive from slavery on the ground that "person" did not mean women? To this, that gentleman or his coadjutors did not attempt to reply. It may be further remarked, though it may seem unnecessary in a matter so self-evident, that any pretension in derogation of general right must be so clearly ascertained and established as to leave no doubt on the subject. Thus, in excluding colored men from serving in the militia and mail departments, the laws of the United States declare that none but "free white male citizens," or "free white persons," shall be employed or enrolled. Congress were well aware that if they did not use the term "white male citizens," negroes, mulattoes, slaves, and women would be enrolled in the militia; and if they did not use the term, "free white persons," negroes, &c., would be employed in carrying the mails. It had been stated at the previous Annual Meeting that, under the Constitution of New Jersey, formed in 1776, securing the right of suffrage to all *inhabitants* of full age and possessed of a certain amount of property, women were held to possess that right, and did exercise it whenever they claimed so to do. To these other like arguments no reply was made; and none can be made. It was well observed by the venerable Seth Sprague, of Massachusetts, that to exclude women under this provision, was as absurd as it would be to exclude bachelors, and to say that none but married men were intended by the Constitution to act in the Society. In a word, the pretence that negroes are not *men*, the most constant and virulent of all the pro-slavery slang, has never received more countenance than it would have done in this narrow and unnatural attempt to disfranchise and degrade a portion of its members had been sanctioned by the Society.

Such is the "head and front of our offending." In relation to what is called "the woman's rights question," the American Anti-Slavery Society has, and has had, nothing to do. It maintains the rights of neither men nor women, except as defined and settled in its own Constitution.

So sensible were the separatists that the term "person" had, and could have no less extent than we have attributed to it, that they have taken it for granted that women will become members of their new society in whose constitution the term is used in the same way, and in order to exclude them from exercising any of the rights of members, they have disqualified *all members*, as such, from participating in meetings for the transaction of business, and have limited the right of speaking and acting, "to the officers, and such other *men* as may be sent as delegates:" a provision more repugnant to the principles of Abolitionism, can scarcely be imagined. There is sufficient arbitrariness in the principle of this arrangement, to justify any usurpation, even that master one over the liberty, the person and property of the slave.

In another article the new society benignantly invites women to form societies, and provides for their representation by delegates. One would naturally suppose that this means such delegates as they may choose, and of course delegates who are members of their own body, but another clause provides that this representation shall be subject to the limitation in the 8th article, which confines the exercise of the *rights* of membership "to the officers, and such other men as may be sent as delegates." Thus we learn indirectly by comparing the two articles and making an inference from both, that women's societies, if any should be formed under this kind and liberal provision, must choose males, of course strangers to their society, for their representatives in this christian sanhedrim. Hence arises a new solecism, that the attorney is clothed with power, which the constituents do not possess and never can possess, and cannot, therefore, according to any known principle, impart. To such unhappy and preposterous devices may one false step ultimately lead.

On the general question of women's rights which the separatists perversely persist in confounding with the question of their constitutional powers and duties as members of this society, we would observe that there is not, so far as we are informed, one in a hundred of this, or any Anti-Slavery body in the country, who is not either indifferent or positively opposed to the views said to be entertained by individuals in and out of the Anti-Slavery societies. We declare unhesitatingly that all representations to the contrary of this are untrue, and, tending as they do, to excite against this and kindred societies increased, popular odium and new persecution, they must in all candor and moderation be pronounced calumnious. It is our duty to the cause and to our constituents to nail this counterfeit, which has been so extensively circulated. As Abolitionists we meddle not with the theories of men or women, friends or foes, on this subject, and we have no right to do so any more than we have to regulate the relation betwixt husband and wife, or parent and child. Those opinions, whatsoever they may be, are just as inviolable to this society as the peculiar religious views of its members. He who believes women to be in every respect equal to men and entitled to a perfect equality of rights and privileges, and he who believes her to be in every respect inferior is entitled to stand without fear and without reproach upon the American Anti-Slavery platform. And may Heaven avert the day when we shall push from it any true friend of our great and most Catholic enterprize, an enterprize beset with so many difficulties and discouragements, as to demand all the aid which can be derived from every human being, who has a heart to feel for human wo.

2. To the second reason of the separatists it was answered that *slavery* was agreeable to the usages of the civilized world, and from this fact slaveholders derive a favorite and stereotyped argument against all the principles and operations of Abolitionists.

3. To the third reason it was answered that if women had powers and duties under our constitution, and they came here claiming to exercise those powers and perform those duties, those who attempted to wrest from them their constitutional privileges, not those who defended them, were chargeable with throwing a fire-brand into the society. Let them cease their assaults upon the rights of their associates and upon the constitution, and there would be no longer fire-brands or heart-burnings amongst us.

4. The scriptural objection was not insisted on by the separatists, nor alluded to by any of the leaders of the party at the late annual meeting. But inasmuch as great use has been made of it, and may be hereafter on other occasions, we deem it proper not to pass it by without notice

The religious obligations of the members of this society are matters within the exclusive cognizance of their own consciences. It is enough for the society that it was not constituted to adjudicate upon the soundness of Christian creeds, or to compel conformity of faith among its members on disputed points of theology.

The texts relied on by the separatists when they attempt to make any thing of this theme are the following: "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak:"* "And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home, for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."† In another epistle St. Paul enjoins more generally that women shall not "teach."* The apostle was impressed by education and custom with the importance of the Jewish method of managing women, methods still in practice among Asiatic tribes. He frequently descends to minute details on this subject, which it is presumed that the most heresy-hunting disposition would not enforce upon members of an Anti-Slavery Society, nor of their own families. Thus he directs women not to wear ornaments of "gold or pearl," nor to pray or prophesy without having their heads either veiled or shorn. The discrepancy of the implication here that women did pray and prophesy in public, with the argument with which we are dealing, is too obvious to require comment. Could they prophesy without speaking? Besides, prophet in scripture often means merely a speaker. "And Moses said, O Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant:" "and the Lord said "Is not Aaron, the Levite, thy brother? I know that he can speak well." "He shall be thy spokesman." "Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet." "Aaron, thy brother, shall speak unto Pharaoh that he send the children of Israel out of the land."

In the early history of the Puritans in Massachusetts, we have a notable instance of the rulers and elders undertaking to compel women to observe certain of the oriental regulations respecting apparel. They disciplined women for coming to church unveiled. They said that the apostle had prohibited that practice; and among the agreements to show the reasonableness and necessity of the rule, they said that the comely faces of the women diverted their thoughts from religious subjects.† But the rulers and elders with that famous compeller of conformity, Governor Endicot at their head, failed in their crusade for the veils.

Several religious sects in this country allow and encourage women to speak in their public meetings, and a majority of Sunday school and other *teachers* throughout are women. But really we feel that such objections are too trifling to occupy the attention of Abolitionists. It is enough for us that the jealous and despotic restraints of Jewish and Turkish females are not incorporated into our constitution, and the Anti-Slavery societies have repeatedly, and with wonderful gravity, considering the ridiculous nature of the proposition, refused to engraft them by a forced construction.

We have now noticed the only reasons offered by the separatists in the late annual meeting in justificatien of their course. But in their address "to the Friends of the Anti-Slavery cause in the United States and the world," they state another ground which they declare to be the "chief" matter of difference, though by circumstances it was made less on the occasion above mentioned.

They set out with saying that the same persons, belonging to the Anti-Slavery ranks, (meaning the entire American Anti-Slavery Society,) who are contending for women's rights—the civil and political equality of women with men, deny the obligation of forming, supporting or yielding obedience to civil government, and refuse to affirm the *duty* of political action."

Assuming that they have already fixed upon the American Anti-Slavery Society, and some of its most active and useful auxiliaries, the charge of being "women's rights" societies; and intimating, moreover, that this description of our society is quoted from our own language, they proceed to charge us with refusing to affirm the *duty* of political action," and thus departing from the constitution, which they say "recognizes the lawfulness of human government," and establishes "as a fundamental principle that political action is both expedient and proper.

We need not here enter into a dispute as to the meaning of the constitution on these points, for there is no practical difference of much importance between this society and the separatists in relation thereto. Neither this nor any body of Abolitionists, of which we have any knowledge, discourages or disapproves political action. Individuals differ in opinion as to the best mode of political action, as whether for example, it be expedient to turn our societies into electioneering clubs, and our meetings into caucuses; but that any Anti-Slavery Society opposes political action in general, or has not, on the contrary, undertaken and pursued it in some form with unsparing zeal, untiring vigor, and beneficial results, is a false and wicked misrepresentation. The assertion, however, is as consistent with veracity as the one that we are a "woman's rights" society. All that we have refrained from doing has been and is, to compel by public admonitions and censures unanimity in the choice of the manner and instruments of political action.

We know no Abolitionist who objects to petitioning, and in that way they recognize civil government, even as the separatists demand. The charge, sifted of circumlocution and false coloring, amounts simply to this,—that we refuse to dictate to Abolitionists on the subject of politics, as we have on the interpretation of scripture. Such attempts could not fail to disgust our free spirited associates, sow discord, as they *have*, and ultimately break our fraternal phalanx in pieces.

It is a striking commentary on the sincerity of the charge against *us* on the score of political action, that the separatists, in forming their new organization, have not adopted any test of politico-abolition orthodoxy. They disclaim, "as a society," the machinery of party political arrangements, and "leave that for the action of individual citizens." Here, then, for aught that our optics can discern, we are perfectly agreed. This is precisely what we have always said in the most explicit terms.

In fact, we have been informed, although the debates in their Convention have not been published, nor the original draft of the Constitution, nor the amendments proposed and adopted or rejected, whereby we should have some clue to the real state of opinion among them on the pretended differences betwixt us, yet we may state, as matter of public report, during the sittings of the Convention, that a political test was attempted, and gave rise in their own body to dissensions so alarming that it was deemed prudent to give it the go-by, laying it on the table, where it still lies. Their Constitution, however, does enjoin, as a duty, the exercise of political power in behalf of the slave, and goes on to enumerate specific modes of exercising it. And what are these? Take their own words, "That the legislative action of governments should be invoked to abolish slavery, and the slave trade; for the enfranchisement of the free people of color; and to restrain the lawless from violating the rights of others." Now, what does all this amount to? Simply to this, that new organizationists ought to *petition*. All this amplification means no more.

It is a principle of interpretation in all legal instruments, constitutions, and compacts, that by an enumeration of particulars under a general principle, the application of that principle is limited to the enumerated particulars. The duty of petition is therefore the whole duty of political action, which the new society has enjoined!

And was it for this cause, "chiefly;" was it to enjoin a duty which every Anti-Slavery Society, and every Anti-Slavery man and woman in the country, so far as we know and believe, has performed, year in and year out, for the last five years, that they have rent our Abolition fraternity in twain? Was it for this, that they sought to destroy it?

We do not find in the Address, the Constitution, or resolutions of our disaffected brethren, a syllable on the duty of voting for friends of the slave, at the polls. Is this, then, the result of the war, open and in disguise, which has been waged for two years upon particular Abolitionists and societies, because the former had conscientious doubts about the propriety of voting at all, and the latter refused to anathamatize them for their doubts? And with what grace or decency can the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Society continue to assail the American Anti-Slavery Society and its auxiliaries, for "refusing to affirm the duty of political action," when they have, on this point, openly abandoned every thing distinctive in practice between us and themselves.

We might, perhaps, content ourselves with having exposed this abandonment on the part of the separatists, of the great ground of their defection in that act, wherein, if sincere, they would have brought it forward with peculiar alacrity and emphasis; and failing to establish it, would have refused to pursue the formation of a new society, and have returned to the old. To show, however, the injustice and folly of past assumptions on this subject, and to prevent a recurrence of the error, we will state what we believe to be the true intent and meaning of the clauses of the Constitution of our Society, which speak of "influencing Congress in a constitutional way," and of "doing all that is lawfully in our power, to bring about the extinction of slavery." These expressions occur in the preamble and the 2d article, and we think that a misconstruction of them has been the principal means of lending countenance and support to the old assumptions of the separatists on the subject of political action.

Laws are of two kinds, those which command, and those which prohibit something. The clauses above recited clearly belong to the latter class. Their meaning is not that we should do *everything* which is lawful or constitutional, but that we should do *nothing* unlawful or unconstitutional.—They are simple restraining causes which enjoin nothing, but prohibit something.

At the time the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed, there was much jealousy and misrepresentation in the country in respect to the character and designs of the new Abolition Associations. In order to remove honest doubts, and all pretences of the ill-disposed, it was deemed expedient to insert in the Constitution several pledges, that in no case would we do ourselves, or encourage others to do, aught against the constitutions and laws of the land.—Hence the adoption of the provisions in question, not to impose any positive duty upon the Society or its members, but simply to assure the country that we would undertake or approve nothing contrary to our duty as citizens and subjects of the laws.

If the meaning be that we are to do every thing that is constitutional and lawful, then (to say nothing of the physical impossibility, for it would require the hands of Briareus,) the question so often put tauntingly and foolishly by our enemies, may be justly pressed home upon our disaffected friends; "*why do you not go to the South?*" It is both constitutional and lawful for any and every Abolitionist, to deliver Anti-Slavery lectures and distribute our tracts. If it be said that this is forbidden by the State laws, we answer that it is not forbidden in all the slave states, nor is it forbidden in respect to the *masters and whites* in any of them. It is only with the slaves that it is unlawful to communicate.

It is constitutional and lawful to live on the coarsest fare, to be clad in the coarsest raiment, to sleep but four out of twenty-four hours as thousands of slaves are compelled to do, to journey on foot, beg our food, and bestow all our income and our economies, in enlightening the masters and releasing the slaves. Above all, it is lawful to abstain from slave labor produce. But will any man maintain that our constitution enjoins these as *imperative duties*, merely because we have pledged ourselves in that instrument, that *all* the means we shall use shall be lawful? The constitution and laws permit us to seek martyrdom at any moment in the cause, and we should like to know how a disaffected brother who holds to this absurd construction of our constitution could reply to the question *why don't you go and be lynched?* He would say perhaps that we are bound by laws higher than human to preserve our lives and employ them in this and every good work until the providence of God shall call us from our labor, then we answer that this is surrendering the whole question, for those of our brethren who refuse to give or receive votes at political elections, do so expressly on the ground that these acts would contravene the laws of God. It is no part of our duty to pronounce judgment upon the truth or sincerity of such professions. "Let every one be persuaded in his own mind" "To his own master he standeth or falleth.

We repeat, therefore, that the provisions in question are restraining and negative, not positive and enjoining, and we must presume that the separatists either had no settled ideas about them, or that they regarded them in the same light. Otherwise they would not, in forming their new constitution, have limited themseles to declaring only *one* mode of political action a duty. They alledge, as the general ground of their dissatisfaction with this society, that it does not in practice carry out the principles of its constitution. Now why have they not carried out those principles, as they have interpreted them and attempted to obtrude their interpretation upon others? Is one mode of political action, the subscribing of a petition, all the political action, which the constitution and laws permit! In establishing and enjoining this one mode, we think they are chargeable with gross inconsistency, for if it be a *duty* of Abolitionists to exercise in all cases the inferior right of *petition*, much more is it their duty to exercise the higher and more effective right of the elective franchise. The explanation of this incongruity we suppose to be this: The "new organization" felt that after making it a subject of grave and clamorous accusation against this society, that it "refused to affirm the *duty* of political action," (the *italics* are theirs) they could not decently omit it wholly themselves, but they found even in their own body such a variety of sentiment and such an inconvenient spirit of freedom and of inquiry, that it was impossible to extend such a declaration beyond one and the lowest form of political action, because on that all happen at this time to be practically agreed; and therefore were not disposed to make it a matter of theoretrical dispute, where so much matter of dispute was already on their hands.

It has been seen that the separatists hesitate not to stigmatize this society as "a woman's rights" and "non-resistant" society, to charge us with new "sectarian views" because we believe women to be "persons," with "sanctioning principles evidently foreign to any thing set forth in our constitution," "glorifying men of like passions with ourselves," disappointing the confidence reposed in our "integrity," and much of the like. Yet they pray that "it may not be imagined that their society has any desire to wage war upon any other association. Far from it. It has been (they continue) a source of grief to the true friends of the slave, and of exultation to the enemies of human rights, to see a denunciatory spirit towards brethren engaged in the sublime cause of emancipation." Yet they call this whole society "woman's rights," and "no government men," and "non-resistants," contrary to the repeated disclaimers of a belief, or even knowledge of the theories designated by those phrases; and having so denominated us, they charge upon the whole class with inflicting "wounds with the tongue and pen as really as they would do with any other weapons." This, we suppose, is no war—this is kindness and conciliation! The very worst and most aggravating of all wars, is war in disguise, war which comes with the smile of peace. But we cherish no hostility towards our disaffected brethren.

There is something ingenious in the affected imputation upon our "integrity." To set up certain opinions and requirements of their own as a standard of truth and duty, and then to impeach the integrity of all those, who do not come up to it. The Arabs, no doubt, think a man must be a great villain who will not suffer himself to be quietly stripped of his shirt and shoes. The military despot of France caused it to be declared to President Jefferson that "the Emperor expected it from the *candor and dignity* of the government of the union that all commerce should cease with the *Haytians*, that race of African slaves, the reproach and refuse of nature." The American government, with a slaveholder at its head, and, as usual, a pro-slavery party in power, hastened to respond to the Emperor's notion of "candor and dignity," and passed "an act suspending all commercial intercourse" with those parts of Hayti in possession of the heroic "refuse of nature." We suppose that we might with equal credit to ourselves prove to the separatists our "integrity."

The charge against this society, which the separatists appear to deem next in importance to no-governmentism and womanism, relates to the manner and circumstances of the assembly of the late annual meeting. In their chagrin at the result of that meeting, their liberality inclines them to criminate all that contributed to it. We wonder that they have not found fault with the sunshine and the wind. Three several times in their short manifesto they bring forward the accusation that the majority of this society at the late meeting was "a *packed* delegation," and they repeatedly assert that it was only in a packed meeting that their own views did not find favor and support. *Packing* is a term derived from the gaming table and it implies secret shuffling and fraudulent management to obtain unjust advantage. This is an accusation which, we think, the separatists will yet regret. How were the facts?

The friends of abolitionism in its original largeness and purity, were called upon openly for weeks and months to come to the rescue of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the integrity of which was periled by the untoward proceedings of sectarians and politicians holding its helm. At this call a host arose and girded themselves about, filled with indomitable zeal and some indignation. Was this fraudulent, was this corrupt; or was it the true and bright metal of American abolitionism? Had there been less life, had not the principles of their great cause quickened and pervaded their whole moral being, they would have remained at home earning and saving, instead of spending money. A steamboat was chartered by members of the Massachusetts society, and there was indeed a good deal of *packing* on board of that craft. But we look upon her as we do upon the *May-flower*. One motive of this measure was to secure accommodations to colored brothers and sisters, who are still subject to dangerous exposures and mortifying indignities on board of ordinary passenger boats.

Such was "the packing" of which the majority at the late annual meeting stand indicted, and which the separatists state for the third time in the following words.

"The same persons belonging to the Anti-Slavery ranks, who are contending, for *what they call women's rights*, the civil and political equality of women with men, deny the obligation of forming, supporting, or yielding obedience to civil government, and refuse to affirm the duty of political action; and they *contrived* to *bring* to the late annual meeting a sufficient number of men and women to compose a majority of all the members present, to sustain their views and measures. Of the whole number present this year *four hundred and sixty-four* were from the single State of Massachusetts, styling themselves "non-resistants," and professing to be opposed to all physical force either of offence or defence, but not disclaiming in their practice the use of the tongue and pen as weapons—weapons that often inflict wounds as really as any other weapons could do—with which to assail those who are for maintaining the primitive objects of the society, they seem determined to carry forward their favorite theories and practices at all events, even if the great moral enterprise in which they and we originally embarked should retrograde, and be justly offensive to those who might otherwise join the Anti-Slavery ranks and help on the cause of impartial liberty to a glorious consummation."

That "four hundred and sixty four" should have come from Massachusetts, from which have sprung most of the reforms and improvements of this nation, and a good share of those of the age, we regard as one of the best omens to the cause, as the best living testimony to the soundness of our principles. "But four hundred and sixty four" was the entire attendance from that State, and so many of them as constituted a majority or nearly so on the test question *came* as friends of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, or New Organization, so called, and of the late Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The number of these has been variously estimated at one hundred and upwards. It was certainly not less than that number. And yet the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society are so reckless of accuracy, as to represent the entire attendance of four hundred and sixty four as the result of the great "contriving and packing" system of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society and a majority of this Society. But this was not enough: they seem to have been led on by an unaccountable infatuation to distil a little antidote along with poison; for they say "styling themselves non-resistants, &c." what, the whole, new organizationists and all? But waiving this point, who does not see the evident falsity of asserting that the whole of the friends and supporters of the Massachusetts and American Anti-Slavery Societies from that State "style themselves Non-Resistants." Whatever they or we may be, every body knows that neither have avowed the name or principles of Non-Resistants.

There can be no excuse for such disengenuousness as this. There could be no motive for it, but to excite new odium and new persecutions against those they still call brothers.

And does the respected President of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, suppose that converts are to be made, the disaffected strengthened and the people taken by such tales? But they serve to show the fallacious and head-strong spirit which prevailed in the formation of that Society, and this the disaffected will find is about all the bearing it will have on us or them.

But we must not dismiss the subject of packing yet. We certainly have no objection to summoning the friends of a cause in any and every fair way to its support. We find no fault with circulars however earnest provided they tell the truth. But a circular has been put into our hands by a person in New Jersey, to whom it was addressed, which we do think objectionable. This document after repeating the stale and oft refuted calumnies against our Massachusetts brethren, called upon all persons who should receive it, to come to the rescue of the late Executive Committee; and distinctly proposed that if such person were not already a member of the American Anti-Slavery Society, that he should make himself so at the meeting for the very purpose of controlling its proceedings, and *for no other!* We are authorized in making this conclusion by the fact that in stating in this connexion the conditions of membership, the document declared that consenting to the principles of the Constitution was the only condition, leaving out that of "contributing to the funds of the Society," and thus showing a consciousness of a design to bring into the meeting as members, persons, who did not feel interest enough in the cause to contribute a shilling to it. How many such recruits there were to whom the interests of our sacred cause were for a day submitted, it is impossible now to determine. Doubtless some of the votes given were by persons thus introduced by stealth; but the yeas and nays were not taken, and if they had been there was no book of accounts or records at the meeting, to enable us to ascertain, whether individuals voting, were legitimate members or not. Thus we see that while old, faithful, and self-sacrificing members were to be deprived of their votes and other rights as members, individuals were surreptiously employed to usurp those rights for the very purpose of wresting them from those to whom they have constitutionally belonged from the foundation of the Society!

This circular was issued by the New-York City Society.

"One of the opposition had the hardihood to charge the majority with "packing" in open session of the Society, whereupon the Editor of the Emancipator, and for some years previous, the Recording Secretary of the American Society,* remarked to a friend, "I dont think there's any room for us to talk about that." Another gentleman on the same side however requested a friend of this Society to observe, that "*he* said nothing about packing."

We can inform the disaffected of the true secret of packing a meeting. It is to be right, and to maintain the right with honest zeal and single-mindedness. Then human hearts are touched, then answers deep to deep; and then

"From cliff to cliff leaps the live thunders."

Having now said what we deem necessary in relation to the late Annual Meeting, to the defection of our brethren, to the avowed causes thereof, to the formation of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and in reply to its

* 1 Cor. 14. † 1 Cor. 14, 35.

* 1 Tim. 2, 12.

† See the speech of the Rev. Mr. Ludlow at the late annual meeting of the Connecticut Anti-Slavery Society.

* Joshua Leavitt.

manifesto, we shall speak of what we believe to be the true causes of the division in our ranks.

When the light of Abolitionism first shone upon the thick darkness of the land, chiefly through the instrumentality of an obscure and self-educated individual, the clergy and the Church were startled at the exposure of the enormity of the national wickedness, against which they had raised no warning voice, but with which they had been always, with very rare exceptions, compromising and striking hands.—They were sincerely frightened at the awfulness of the responsibility which had accumulated and was still increasing upon them. In such circumstances they felt the necessity of action. The hypocrisy, fraud, and cruelty of the Colonization scheme had been unfolded too clearly and conclusively, to permit that Society to be any longer a safe or satisfactory rallying point.

In this state of thing they determined upon a new organization. Repudiating, as they did, expatriation as a remedy for slavery, and an epitome of our duties to two millions of innocent and tortured brethren, the natural impulse of fair and unprejudiced minds, would have been to unite with the existing Anti-Slavery Society, and if it were not as useful and respectable as might be, to lend their aid to make it more so. They admitted it to be right in principle, but did not like its measures, and thought that the right kind of men had not taken hold of the subject. We believe, in fact, that they were influenced by pharisaical pride, and if they had spoken as freely as those of olden time, they would have said, "is not this the printer's boy; has he not waited in the kitchen for copy, and his mother, does she not live here in Newburyport with us!" Besides this, the clergy have always been in the habit of taking possession of every benevolent and moral cause which stirred deeply and strongly the hearts of their societies and the community, and they disdained to play a second part in the Abolition movement. Accordingly, after much correspondence and preparation, they assembled at Boston, in December 1834, to the number of 200, with a few laymen among them. Several members of the Massachusetts and of the American Anti-Slavery Society, were in attendance, and attempted to speak upon the question of the necessity of a new organization; but they were interrupted and silenced by clamor.

The Convention proceeded to form what was called the "*American* Union, for the relief of the people of color."—Some idea of the spirit and character of this assemblage may be formed from the fact, that the Rev. Dr. Channing was at first appointed a vice president, but afterwards, in violation of their own Constitution, the Society struck out his name and inserted another. And they were about to proceed in like manner with the only remaining Unitarian, Professor Willard, of Harvard University, when that gentleman's sudden appearance in the meeting arrested the proceeding. This association was universally regarded as sectarian. Another indication of its spirit was familiar in the mouths of men at the time. Mr. Charles Tappan, one of the officers, called upon an editor of a daily paper, and requested him to publish the proceedings. The editor declined; whereupon Mr. Tappan declared with emphasis, that the "object was to put down Garrison!" If they thought Garrison unfit to be a leader in this great movement, the obvious remedy was to unite with the Anti-Slavery Society, and commit its management to better hands. But it did not suit their spirit and purpose to associate with the original founders of American Abolitionism. These were a sturdy, independent set of men, who could stand alone for the right, and whom no array of numbers or weight of names, could induce to swerve from a straightforward course. Another objection to them was, that every sort of heresy was mixed up in their association, with rather a predominating proportion of orthodoxy. Contact of the faithful with heretics has always been annoying to those who thrive by the zeal which religious divisions and sub-divisions strike out of one another. This succumbed under its own weight and lifelessness, within a twelve-month after its birth, and it is now sunk into such perfect oblivion, that without reference to its records, we feel great doubt whether we have stated correctly its title. The truth was, that this society found no middle ground on which they could stand. It was all occupied, either by the Anti-Slavery Society on one side, or Colonization and pro-slavery on the other. Not content with no standing at all, they dispersed every man to his tent, and that was an end of the concern, but not of its spirit: that unfortunately survived. It did not, however, openly manifest itself again until the summer of 1837.

At that time the appeal, commonly known as the "clerical appeal," suddenly made its appearance. This document was subscribed by five orthodox ministers. At the head of them was the Rev. Charles Fitch, who has since confessed his error, and made amends in so conscientious and magnanimous a manner, that we would name him only with respect and affection. The appeal was strongly seconded by a considerable body of students at Andover Theological seminary; and there is no doubt that the sentiments were approved by the faculty of that institution.

The burden of the "clerical appeal" was the bad management and measures of the existing societies in the State of Massachusetts. The appellants complained that "many worthy men were prevented" by this cause "from appearing in favor." They must be worthy men indeed, and valuable friends of virtue, to be prevented from doing their duty to a righteous cause for the reason that they apprehended that others were not doing their duty in the wisest manner! What sort of defence will this be at the judgment seat!—"Men who have a quick sense of propriety," continue the clerical appellants, "are not willing to be identified with such movements. Their hearts bleed for the oppressed, but they are beaten off from active exertion in their behalf by these unjustifiable measures. They suppose that the great body of Abolitionists approve of these things because they suffer them in silence. It moreover is to be feared that, unless a different course is pursued, many who in times past have labored much in this cause, will withdraw in despair and weep in secret places."

Very soon the appellants had reason to know that there was no mistake about the great body of Abolitionists "approving of these things," for at a Convention of Abolitionists from all parts of the State, held at Worcester specially to consider and act on this subject, the clerical appeal was nailed to the counter by a vote of 400 to 1.

The Andover appeal was more frank and explicit than the original one. It declared that "the sentiment on the subject of slavery had passed from the head to the heart of the nation. A spirit of stern enthusiasm is pervading the community, kindling its sympathies and enlisting its strength in efforts for the speedy removal of this great and crying national iniquity."

"We have cherished a belief that the time was not distant when a platform would be erected on which New England Christians would be constrained to meet."

"We desire to second the appeal of men, whom we respect and love, and with whose feelings we sympathize; and to bear our humble testimony against some of the measures which are obstructing the progress and defeating the triumph of correct principles!"

The objectionable measures specified by the Andover students were.

1. A strain of remark upon the Gospel ministry fitted to impair its influence.

2. Statements prejudicial to the cause of foreign missions and to the character of the A. B. C. F. M. They declare under this head that a prominent reason of their opposition to Slavery, is that it interposes fatal obstacles" "to the faithful labors" of missionary societies, "for the most enlarged and successful diffusion of Christianity."

3. "Speculations, tending to disorganization and anarchy, and surrounding the cause of emancipation with foreign and repulsive associations, making it responsible for heresies with which it has no affinity."

4. "An unwarrantable interference" with the relation between the church and its members.

5. The public lectures of females in the then "recent instance of departure from propriety" by the Misses Grimke they were "desirous of allowing the individuals the full apology of their religious faith, yet they could not sufficiently regret that their influence was not confined to a sphere of labor which would advance rather than prejudice the cause of emancipation."

We have stated these charges not to comment on them, but as a part of the history of Anti-Slavery conflicts, to which it may be profitable to refer for comparison.

The appeal like the Union was a total failure, yet the spirit survived. By the overwhelming majority at Worcester it was overawed. The newspaper New-England Spectator, which had been the organ of the appellants expired. Murmurs of dissatisfaction and discontent, confined chiefly to the clergy and generally to one denomination were heard from time to time. A public correspondence was soon after commenced between two clergymen of Massachusetts, Dr. Osgood of Springfield and Professor Emerson of the Andover Seminary, in which grievous complaints were uttered by the latter against the measures and the men of the Anti-Slavery Association. The former exhorts his friend not to despair, but to unite in efforts to make both better, and thinks the time at hand when this will be accomplished. To this no rational and sincere friend of the slave can object. But when amendment means proscription, and "getting rid" of original, tried and trusty friends, for the sake of propitiating those, who are neither; we think it is appeasing the pride and purchasing the patronage of the prelacy at too great a price, no less a price than the sacrifice of the purity and progress of the cause. The American clergy must place themselves right before the community and before Christendom in relation to this momentous and ever enlarging question in a manner more consistent with Christian charity, brotherly love and humility; otherwise they will find themselves deserted apace by the people; and they, who refused to lead in a great and necessary national reform, will not even have the privilege of following.

One of our Massachusetts friends soon after the formation of the American Union, illustrated this spirit by a comparison, which we have always thought just, and strictly applicable to the subsequent disturbances of our Anti-Slavery harmony.

"Suppose the Philistines after their champion was slain and they had fled a great way, had halted and taken counsel to this effect: We are routed and ruined. Goliath is dead, and the dead bodies of our host strew the way from Shochoh to Ekron. We have no more the stout warrior, the mighty in battle, to whom the men of war may rally. We must pretend to submit to this race of Egyptian slaves, until we can rise and avenge ourselves on them that vex us. Now therefore let us send them our crafty ones with the priests of Dagon to propose a covenant of peace, offering to come under their vain theocracy, and pay them tribute, *on condition* that they first hang *that David*, or if not, that they at least take away *his sling*."

We are now arrived at the period 1838, when operations were commenced, for forming what has been technically called the New Organization; and establishing an opposition paper as its organ in Massachusetts. These operations were conducted in secret during much of that year, primarily by the Rev. A. A. Phelps, general agent of the old Massachusetts Society, aided by Mr. Stanton and other agents appointed by the late Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society. These gentlemen and all the other leaders in this business, were of the same religious denomination as the clerical appellants and the American Union. It would occupy too much space in this address to enter into an examination in detail of those operations. We recommend to those who are uninformed or unsatisfied on this subject, a small volume entitled "Right and Wrong in Massachusetts" by *Maria Weston Chapman*. 1839.

The projectors of this movement did not perhaps aim directly at a new organization, but rather to get possession of the old Massachusetts, (originally the New England and the pioneer,) Society; and to establish the new paper with its sanction and at its expense. They professed to be warmly attached to that society, and their agents for obtaining subscriptions to the proposed paper were instructed to say that it was not intended to injure the circulation of the Liberator, but on the contrary to extend it, being enabled by smallness and cheapness to go where the Liberator at present could not, and thus to prepare the way for it. In this one person an old and efficient Abolitionist and a fast friend of the old society and of the Liberator, was actually induced to undertake to get subscribers for the opposition paper. He was undeceived by an exclamation of the Rev. Parsons Cooke, who on affixing his name to the list said with energy, "I'll do anything to put down Garrison."

At the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Society, January 1839, the struggle took place. The disaffected were defeated by a majority about as decisive as at the Worcester Meeting. A new paper was however commenced, called the Massachusetts Abolitionist. At the New England Convention in May following, the disaffected finally seceded. The occasion which they selected was the admission of Abolitionists to seats in the convention without distinction of sex. This society was formed by a small number of persons in a private apartment without any public and general notice of the time, place or purpose. It has always been supposed that the founders were apprehensive, that if a meeting of *Abolitionists* were called with a view to form a new organization, they would the first thing vote by an immense majority that no new organization was needed.

The principal justifications put for the separation, were:

1. The allowing of women to have the *rights* of members in societies and conventions, though they did not allege any objection to their paying their money and *becoming* members.

2. The refusal of the old society to pass resolutions that it was the bounden duty of every Abolitionist to vote at the polls, "if he would not prove that neither love to God nor man held any place in his heart." The Rev. Charles Trask, an orthodox minister, having returned to the Convention after the separation had taken place, and obtained leave to speak in justification of it, delivered himself in substance as follows;

"He did not hold to the maxim, 'united we stand, divided we fall.' Both societies would do good. There were some things which the old Society could do, and some things which the new could do, all of which could be done by neither. Sir," said he with increasing warmth, "Sir, we want the men of influence in our ranks. It is in vain that you attempt to carry any cause in this country without them. We want the *Honorables*, the D. D's., the Rabbies of the land. Now, our 'new organization' will get them. They will join us, but they will never join you. Your Society is too radical for them. They will come to us, and we shall give them offices: Sir, they wont come without we give them offices."

Abolitionists, in their indignation at "the worst system of human villany which exists," and at the envious opposition of "the rabbies of the land to their efforts for its extermination, have perhaps treated them with a less marked deference than they are accustomed to receive from their fellow-citizens in general. Their habit is to use a strong, plain, and primitive style of rebuke; because they feel that in no other language could they express their sense of the pre-eminent wickedness of the system which they suppose it to be their mission to destroy. Those ministers who perform their duty to the slave, are not offended by the sharpness of their reproofs, but on the contrary make them sharper. This manner, while the matter remains, cannot be surrendered to please men. If we say, "Scribes and Pharisees, Hypocrites," "ye bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders, but will not yourselves move them with one of your fingers," "you make broad your phylacteries," and "love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues," and "to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi;" and any good man is offended at it, there is but one remedy for the case, and that is, for him to withdraw himself from the class to which he is conscious that the language applies. If he be good, his very displeasure, betraying that consciousness, ought to be an admonition to him to pause and re-examine the case, and carefully review his own course.

We must say, however, that if a harder thing was ever said of the clergy by any Abolitionist than was uttered on this occasion, by their brother Trask, we are yet to learn what it was.

A society founded or acting on the principles avowed by Mr. Trask, might do well enough if nothing was to be done but to be printed, to hold anniversaries, and to make pretty addresses to please everybody and benefit nobody. But a real Anti-Slavery Society has work, of which anniversary parades and speeches are the smallest and a very insignificant part. An Anti-Slavery Society, on the principle avowed by this new organizationist, (and the speech was evidently intended to be peculiarly candid and hearty,) would be a slave itself, as much worse off than other slaves, as voluntary slavery is worse than compulsory. It would be imbecile for every good and manly purpose, from its birth, and its speedy death could be the only atonement for its worthless life. This country has one example of such a society, and it must forget much before it will countenance another.

To these facts we may add the general testimony of a clergyman of Massachusetts of the same denomination with those who have originated and managed all these movements, but a hearty Abolitionist and an upright man, that the real cause of these successive attempts to obtain the control and to change the manner and course of Anti-Slavery action, is the free and bold discussion in Anti-Slavery meetings and Anti-Slavery periodicals, of the relation of the church and clergy to slavery and the slave-trade. His knowledge of the fact is derived from personal and pressing applications, which have been made to himself, to unite in the "holy war."

The late Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society refrained from any expression of opinion upon the merits of these important struggles in the great cause which they were appointed to superintend and to promote. To some this silence itself seemed very expressive. One of three associates in business accuses a second of having neglected the duties and departed from the line of the partnership; of betraying its interests and treacherously applying its resources to a foreign object; the third *knowing all the facts*, listens to this and utters not a word. Is not this taking sides! What inference does such behavior admit of, except that he deems the charges true and the conduct of his accused partner wholly indefensible. If he knew it to be otherwise, it was his duty to say so; and if he thought the accusations merited, he ought to say that too, and to endeavor by doing right to put an end to the controversy. This is what any one of that Committee would have hastened to do if the concern had been a private one of his own; but they appear to have felt at liberty to manage a great public one upon totally different principles.

The organ of the new organization was established by Mr. Stanton, one of the salaried Secretaries of the Executive Committee at New-York, and conducted by him principally to the time that another Secretary, E. Wright, Jr., resigned his office at New-York, and took charge of the journal in Massachusetts.

Cotemporary with these proceedings the Executive Committee demanded of the Massachusetts society payment of the second instalment of the State pledge of Ten Thousand Dollars to the American Society, made at its annual meeting in May previous. The first instalment of $2000, had been paid, and the delay in meeting the second was consequent on the extraordinary expense and attention bestowed on the Middlesex election of a Representative to Congress, an occasion deemed more important in relation to political action, by Abolitionists throughout the country, than any other which has occurred since the origin of the Anti-Slavery Organization. The express condition on which the pledge was made, was, that the Massachusetts Society should have the entire control of the cause in the State. The Executive Committee at New-York, were rigorous in their call for the second instalment, and notwithstanding the protest of the Massachusetts Board, they openly disregarded the condition on which the pledge was made, and deputed agents to collect it.

This circumstance was one of the chief causes of those wide-spread dissensions that have been so rife in our ranks for sometime past, and which have destroyed that confidence which was the bond of our union.

The Executive Committee put forth a circular, and addressed it to Abolitionists throughout the country, containing partial, exaggerated, and in some respects, erroneous statements of the case. This circular excited great surprise, and some sudden indignation against the Massachusetts Board, for an apparent want of good faith, or for criminal negligence of the cause of the slave. It declared the contract wholly "null and void."

We have said this circular was addressed to Abolitionists throughout the country. There were some to whom it was not addressed: these were the members of the Massachusetts Board. To them it was never communicated by the Executive Committee, either before or after its publication, and a committee of that Board, who had proceeded to New-York, for the purpose of composing the difference by a personal and friendly explanation, failed in their object, the Committee being resolved to pursue their course at all hazards.

These facts need little commentary. It was evident that an unfraternal feeling, and malign influences existed in the Executive Committee, and the supposed financial delinquency of the Massachusetts Board, with the coloring imparted to it of treachery "to the pennyless slave," to printers and mechanics employed in New-York, who were represented as kept out of their hard earnings by the negligence or parsimony of the Massachusetts Society, was seized upon and made the vehicle of a nursed and accumulated displeasure. The circular was signed by *Lewis Tappan, S. E. Cornish, Joshua Leavitt, and Henry B. Stanton.* Mr. Stanton was well aware of the causes of the delay in the Massachusetts Board. He was himself the principal cause, inasmuch as it was understood when the pledge was given, that he was to aid in collecting the money, and when he went to Massachusetts for that purpose he devoted himself to the management of the Middlesex election, in which the money of the Massachusetts Society was expended, but none collected for them.

It is proper to observe that Messrs Stanton and Phelps had the whole control of that field. *They* put in nomination the Rev. James Woodbury as the Abolition candidate, and circulated printed votes in his behalf. This step, we think, was in itself wrong. The Abolitionists of the district generally, and the Massachusetts Board in particular, at whose expense these operations were carried on, had a right to be consulted, both whether a separate nomination should be made, and if so, who should be the individual selected. It was mischievous in its consequences, because the people of that district became so exasperated at this attempt that the county of Middlesex from one of the best and most hopeful, became and continues to be one of the hardest and most discouraging fields of Anti-Slavery labor in the free States. Mr. Woodbury had been a distinguished sympathizer with the clerical appellants, was a friend of the national administration, and in this respect harmonized with Mr. Stanton as he did with both Stanton and Phelps in his sectarian attachments. Mr. Woodbury had also been appointed an agent of the Executive Committee, contrary to the remonstrances of the Massachusetts Board. The same fact is true in regard to other gentlemen concerned in that *coup d'etat*.

The Executive Committee persevered in retaining those agents until the New Organization, when it seems to have transferred to that, the duty of keeping those agents in service. The Executive Committee discharged them after that event, apparently in compliance with the wishes of the Massachusetts Board, but in reality because they knew that the same individuals would be forthwith reappointed by the new formed Abolition Society of that State.

At the time when the Executive Committee was prosecuting its demand of the instalment due on the pledge of the Massachusetts Board, Mr. Phelps, the general agent of that Board, was busy in addressing circulars to Abolitionists in that State, urging them to devote their contributions to the new paper, and stating as an inducement to this course that they would then know what *became of their money*, *innuendo* that they could not be sure of that so long as it went to the Massachusetts Board. The intention probably was to insinuate that money sent to the Treasurer of the Massachusetts Society for Anti-Slavery objects, was perverted by the Board to the support of "Non-Resistance." Mr. Stanton was at the same time sounding some of the leading Abolitionists on the subject of a change of officers of the Massachusetts Society. He suggested as a suitable president the Hon. William Jackson, of Newton, brother of the then and actual president.

It seems impossible to assign any reason, unless it be a sectarian one for this proposal. Francis Jackson has always been an open, active, and efficient friend of the cause; as a man, he is not less respected than his worthy brother. He particularly entitled himself to the esteem and gratitude of Abolitionists by offering his dwelling house for the meetings of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, when they were mobbed, by "gentlemen of property and standing," in their own hall.

The agents appointed by the Executive Committee were from the beginning nearly all of one religious denomination, as was the Committee itself. The impression of Abolitionists, who observed that fact was that their brethren of the Committee sincerely believed that no agents of other denominations could do so much good to the cause, and not a murmur was heard. Ultimately a request came from Massachusetts to appoint the Rev. S. J. May, of Scituate, a local agent simply. To this the Executive Committee demurred for some time, but after an unaccountable lapse of time made the desired appointment.

The Rev. Mr. Phelps, in reading from his pulpit, a few months since, a notice of a union concert of prayer for the slave, to be held in one of the apartments of the building in which his meeting house is, took occasion to remark that he had communicated the notice as he felt obliged to do so, but he felt it his duty to observe that when he became general agent of the Massachusetts Society, he established a monthly concert of prayer for the slave, but it had died out;* when he became pastor of that church, he had established one for his own church, and thus they had a meeting of their own to attend on the evening of the notice.

The one for which the notice was, was an opposition prayer meeting, at which Universalists, Unitarians, and women, and all sorts of people, would probably take part, and there would be the singular spectacle of two sets of people meeting on the same day, under the same roof, to pray for the same object. Mr. Phelps blamed the proprietors of the building for letting a room for the Union Concert of Prayer for the slave. Messrs. Lewis Tappan and A. A. Phelps have been beyond comparison the most active and conspicuous founders of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, and of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. In fact they are the soul of "new organization" wherever it is. Mr. Tappan advised a division of the Massachusetts Society and Mr. Phelps executed it. At the formation of the new society in New-York the former presided and the latter penned, as we have reason to believe, the principal part of the regulations and sentiments adopted. Mr. Phelps and his coadjutors in Massachusetts have mustered their abolition forces with the war cry of "down with the Unitarians." Yet Mr. Phelps knew that only a small minority of the Massachusetts Board were at any time Unitarians, and that a number of orthodox members constantly acted with them, and were conspicuous for the unhesitating, and we might say indignant decision, with which they disapproved and opposed his proceedings.

Since the formation of the American and Foreign society, leading members who took part in that transaction have been heard in a monthly concert of prayer for the slave, to allege as one justification of the new organization that Garrison was bringing into the old society infidels, and universalists. We presume, indeed we know that no peculiar pains is taken to bring them more than there is to bring in ministers, and probably not so much, and none whatever taken to keep out either. Such charges have been made by the agents of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, but they have been abandoned, whenever issue has been taken upon them. The door is wide open to every friend of humanity, and when it shall be jealously held ajar to be shut in the face of any such, be they of this or that sect, sex, country or color, we may date the decline and fall of the noblest, most purifying, most exalting of all the moral enterprises of modern times.

Can there now be a doubt as to the nature of that "platform" which the Andover "seconders of the appeal of men whom they respect and love," foresaw, on which New England *Christians* would be constrained to meet? Meaning we must infer, when the "unjustifiable" and "unwarrantable measures," and the men whom they do *not* respect and love shall be "got rid of," and there is no longer this poor excuse for real aversion or indifference to the cause of freedom and justice to avail itself of. Such a society would be lively and potent indeed! In a late number of the Massachusetts Abolitionist, (June 3d,) of which Mr. Phelps is said to be the editor, we find appended to a notice of an Abolition meeting in which resolutions were passed censuring the new organization and the clergy, the following remark, "*Christians* we think will by and by get their eyes open to what is going on." When it is considered that the word "Christians" is understood by Mr. Phelps in a restricted sense, a sense excluding all except what are called orthodox denominations, the appeal becomes extremely significant. In fact such means have been for a long time and are now constantly resorted to to excite sectarian hostility against the majority of the Abolitionists in the country. Yet those who do these things are the persons who accuse their brethren of pursuing their theories and practices at all events, even if the great moral enterprize in which they and we originally embarked shall retrograde and become justly offensive to those who might otherwise join the Anti-Slavery ranks, and help on the cause of emancipation to a glorious consummation." Here we have the identical grievance of the American Union, the clerical appellants, the Andover seconders, and Prof. Emerson, that "worthy men" are beaten off from active exertion for the slave, though "their hearts bleed for him," and though they "tremble for their country." Do they mean that there are not "good" and "worthy" men in the society! We presume that none will say this—"good" and "worthy" men can then unite with us without impairing that character. What excuse then have "worthy" men, whose "hearts bleed for the oppressed," and who yet do nothing for his relief, or vindication. How shall we obtain the important co-operation of such men! Shall we follow the recipe of the Rev. Mr. Trask! But that would be formal emptiness and miserable imbecelity. It would render our society a sham, and no sham will ever abolish American slavery.

The newspaper, called the Emancipator, was maintained by Abolitionists as the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society. This was done at an expense of three thousand dollars per annum over and above the subscriptions. The entire amount which the Society has sunk in bringing the paper up to its present circulation, is not much short of 20,000 dollars. This paper thus sustained and cherished, has, for the last two years, opposed the wishes of a majority of this Society, and has been an efficient promoter of dissension in our ranks. The editor, like the Rev. Mr. Trask, could see no harm in "a house divided against itself," and thought that both societies might do good, but he did not inform the readers of the Emancipator that the new Society, in the very act of coming into being, accused the old of offences which, if true, would and ought to be fatal to its influence and even its existence. It has been the same with the replies of the Massachusetts Board to documents of the Executive Committee, which had appeared in that paper. Thus the protest of the Massachusetts Board against the summary proceedings of the Executive Committee, respecting the payment of the pledge, never found its way into the Emancipator. One would have thought that the common justice of the press, even if the Emancipator had been under no peculiar obligations to all the Abolitionists in the country, would have secured to that document a place in its columns, it being the reply of the accused to an attack commenced there. With an appearance of fairness, the Executive Committee did cause the document, together with their charges and their rejoinder, and a long argument from Mr. Phelps, in support of all their views and proceedings, to be published in an extra of the New-York *Christian Journal*. Could not the Committee have published an extra of their own paper as well as of another, and even more conveniently and economically! Undoubtedly this would generally be the case. We do not pretend to account for this proceeding. One thing we do know, that the exposition of the Massachusetts side of the affair was never laid before the readers of the Emancipator. The subsequent documents emanating from the Massachusetts Board touching subjects of vital interest to the cause, topics upon which the interest was deep and intense, in the Anti-Slavery body, touching too the conduct of the Emancipator itself, have fared no better; but rather worse. If their existence has been noticed, it has been by such partial and sometimes garbled extracts, with comments as would present the Board in an invidious light, without conveying any information.

The unfairness of the Emancipator has not been confined to matters in dispute betwixt the two Boards. While its editor and correspondents were continually addressing the Abolitionists in favor of "independent nominations," as they are called, for political office, and a third political party, those who disapproved that policy have been unable to obtain a hearing through its columns.

The license of the Emancipator, appointed and maintained as the organ of this Society, for which, in every respect, this Society was responsible, contrasts strikingly with the attempts to trammel up the Liberator, a paper which its editor always refused to make the official organ of any society, or submit to the control of any body of men, preferring to maintain it in entire independence or not to maintain it at all; a paper which never received a farthing from the Anti-Slavery funds, poured into the treasury of the National Society. But for this spirit of independence, the Liberator would have become the organ of the National Society immediately after its formation. Yet because its editor has used that liberty, which he has struggled so hard to maintain, and which no temptation of ease or affluence could induce him to surrender, attempts have continually been made, and by none more than the Emancipator, to control him, and failing to control, to undermine him; and what was equally unjust, to hold the Massachusetts Board, who never interfered with the sentiments and conduct of the paper, and had no right so to do, responsible for what it published! Hence the stale charge against the Massachusetts Society, of "encumbering the cause with foreign subjects."

We look upon this charge as inapplicable even to the editor of the Liberator himself. Was it for nothing that he had toiled on without aid from the general funds, and with a scanty and precarious subsistence, while the Emancipator was consuming those funds at the rate of three thousand a year! Must he who had never contracted an obligation to be directed or overruled by others, submit to a surveillance which the Emancipator, with all its obligations, resolutely spurned?

What is the character of the attempt to dictate to the editor of the Liberator what he should discuss and what he should forbear to discuss or to mention, as being foreign subjects, and encumbering the cause with a load which would retard its progress and give a new blow to "the poor bleeding slave." We will endeavor to expose it.

No man can express an opinion on any subject without having its reception by the world, influenced more or less by the public confidence and respect, which he has previously, and in any way and on any subject, acquired. The editor of the Liberator then, in order to satisfy these uneasy and unreasonable brethren, must be condemned to absolute silence on every subject which *they* did not, or would not perceive to be immediately and obviously connected with the cause. He could not utter a thought on any subject without carrying, in some degree, the weight and influence justly attached to his character as an Abolitionist. Must he, therefore, be silent on all things, except what others may imagine to be the demands of the cause? He might see a connexion which they did not, still he must forego the utterance of himself. Such pretensions are so arbitrary and impertinent that they need only to be stated. Politicians and sectarians have undertaken to say to the editor of the Liberator, what the slaveholders have said to us all, that there are subjects which he shall not discuss!—"Pass not the Iberus. Touch not Saguntum."

Before dismissing the Emancipator, it is proper that we should advert for a moment, to an article which appeared in its last number previous to the Annual Meeting, signed by James G. Birney. This was a formal attack on certain Abolitionists, in relation to subjects, from which the editor had affected to keep entirely aloof, such was his delicacy about encumbering the cause with them, though in reality, he was carrying on, in regard to them, a war in disguise. On this occasion, the battery was permitted to be unmasked. The hope of influencing, decisively, the action of the approaching meeting was too tempting. No scruple was felt to present this exparte statement, at a period so late that the Society must (so far as the Emancipator was concerned,) come to a decision on the subjects of it, before the other side could be heard. Victory, victory was the object. Putting down and silencing was the order of the day. Thanks to the intelligence and independence of the Abolition spirit the object of the writer failed. The old brotherly love and righteous toleration of these men could not be broken up. The Society, notwithstanding the weight of Mr. Birney's character, respected and beloved as he was, decided that women were "persons," and therefore (having paid their money,) *members*, that they were members, and therefore entitled to sit and take part in its meetings. They likewise passed an expressive, but tender censure upon the Executive Committee for their proceedings in relation to the Massachusetts pledge.

From a disposition to conciliate, and a cherished feeling of fraternity, too grateful to the hearts of those engaged in vindicating the universal brotherhood of man, to be suddenly eradicated, the Executive Committee were all re-elected for that year. Their first impulse appears to have been to decline, their course of conduct and policy having been decidedly disapproved by their constituents; and one of them, Mr. Lewis Tappan, did actually resign, but afterwards came in and withdrew his resignation. It was announced that all would resign, and this we have reason to believe was really their intention, but afterwards they changed their minds in a body and determined to stand. From this time, a course of policy was commenced by the Committee, evidently aiming to subvert every important decision made by the Society, which they were appointed to represent. In pursuance of this policy a convention was called at Albany in July, 1839, in terms unprecedented in the history of American Abolitionism. Up to that time, no Abolitionist desirous of taking a seat in an Anti-Slavery Convention, had ever been denied that favor, a favor not to himself or herself, but the reverse. The favor was to the *oppressed*.

The apprehension seems to have been that unless our Abolition sisters were excluded by the form of the call, they could not be excluded at all. This betrays a consciousness in the minds of those who determined that form, that they were going contrary to the genius and disposition of the abolition host. They evidently knew that they were taking it upon themselves to decide this vital point, *because* they felt their side to be unsafe in the hands of the abolition body, however or wherever assembled. The mere form of the call would not in all probability, have restrained that convention, had it not been for the supplementary dogma that the convention had no power in its action, to transgress the terms of the call! a principle vastly convenient for its inventors, but wholly at variance with truth and experience. The Convention which formed the constitution of the United States was called merely to *amend* the articles of confederation, but they threw them aside, and framed an entirely new form of government. The idea that half a dozen persons calling a convention have power to prescribe its action and *determine the qualifications of its members*, is a novelty. The dogma, however, prevailed, probably because it was a novelty which nobody was prepared for, and one half of the Abolitionists of the country were ruled to be incompetent to set in a convention for the abolition of slavery. This decision, though not on the merits of the case, but a matter of form, and though not made by the American Society, was immediately blazoned as a reversal of the vote of that Society at its preceding Annual Meeting; and very recently it has been cited by Mr. Birney as of equal authority with that vote.

In view of the operations of the Executive Committee during the year, we are constrained to believe that they retained their places for the very purpose of conducting the affairs of the Society on every contested point directly in opposition to the express will of the society, with the hope no doubt to convert it by another year to their views. And the founders of the new organization in Massachusetts, as an apology for making their anti-woman's rights society, auxiliary to one which was as much entitled to be called "a woman's rights society" as that of Massachusetts, allege that the vote of the American Society, which they regret will, not as they trust "be repeated."

These things effectually speak the confidence of Abolitionists in the frankness and fidelity of their Executive Committee; their contributions fell off, and nearly all the lecturing agents of the national society were dismissed. Application was made to State societies to come to their aid. Pending this application, a bill for a small amount drawn by an agent, Arnold Buffum in Ohio, was presented at the National Anti-Slavery Treasury in New York and dishonored. It was protested before a notary, and the protest copied by the political and commercial press as an act of bankruptcy on the part of this society. The Emancipator with much display of grief, candidly acknowledged the fact that we *were* bankrupts. Nevertheless there was at that moment a balance of money and effects belonging to the society, of more than 10,000 dollars over and above their debts. The motive for permitting the society's credit and its faith to its agent to be thus impaired and scoffed at by the pro-slavery press we think is apparent.

The transfer of the Emancipator to the New-York City Anti-Slavery Society, conclude this eventful, though concealed portion of Anti-Slavery history. The reason assigned for this step, was that the committee had not funds to continue it even until the annual meeting of the society, which was to take place in one month. Yet it is demonstrated that at that very moment the Executive Committee had at their disposal, clear of all debts a property of eleven thousand dollars! Could not funds have been raised upon this, at least to continue the paper until the society would be consulted as to the final disposal of an establishment, which had cost them so much.

When the faithful and pointed resolutions on the subject of this alienation of our property were brought forward at the annual meeting, Mr. Leavitt, Recording Secretary, who seemed about to leave the house, was specially notified by the Chairman of the Business Committee that the resolutions concerned him, and that he gave him this notice, thinking he might wish to remain. He did remain long enough to hear them read, and to hear one of the most dispassionate and judicious men in the community characterize the transaction as "scuttling the ship," and compare it to the Executive selling the navy to a nation with which we were on the point of war, and then, without offering any defence he withdrew. A committee was appointed to wait on the Executive Committee of the City Society, with instructions to negotiate for a restoration of our paper, and empowered to indemnify against all loss. They did not succeed in this object, though it was plainly understood all round that the paper would be restored on condition that Mr. Leavitt went with it as its editor!

Subsequently Mr. Leavitt came in and complained that the society had gone to the City Society for explanations and had not invited him to give any! adding in an aggrieved tone that *now* he had no explanation to give. The Chairman of the Business Committee reminded him of the special notice, which he had given him in open meeting. Mr. Leavitt made no reply, but again left the house. Thereupon the society voted to lay the subject on the table until the subsequent session, in order to give all persons concerned an opportunity to be present and to offer any remarks which they might deem proper; and the Secretary *pro tem.*, Mr. Bassett was ordered to notify Joshua Leavitt and the Executive Committee of this vote. They were notified accordingly, but none of them appeared. In fact the sale and transfer under such circumstances of the newspaper of a benevolent society, by their Executive Committee, is a measure obviously indefensible and high-handed; and based as the transaction was upon a false representation of pecuniary inability to sustain the publication, can only be regarded as a signal and unexampled instance of violated faith.

Another proceeding of the late Executive Committee, though not so clearly objectionable as the sale of the Emancipator, does yet betray an unreasonable and causeless distrust of the integrity and honor of the American A. S. Society. The books, stereotype plates, and in general all the stock, furniture and books of account and other property of the society were found to have been assigned by the Executive Committee to Lewis Tappan and S. W. Benedict, to pay debts of the society and to indemnify them against liabilities on account of a libel suit, and of the Amistad case. Under this assignment a portion of the books had been sold at *half the trade price*, itself greatly below the retail price (at which this society would have sold them all.) to raise money to pay the arrears of Mr. Stanton's salary and for other purposes. Thus we are at last taught how money *can* be raised on Anti-Slavery books!

The Anti-Slavery office had also been broken up and all the society's late property removed to the Anti-Slavery Depository, now the office of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. We are therefore without such means for immediately prosecuting the Anti-Slavery enterprise. We look upon this transaction as hasty and unreasonable. Had the question been submitted to the society, then about to assemble, can there be a doubt that they would have paid double the amount due to creditors rather than have suffered their entire stock to be sacrificed? Can there be a doubt even that they would have honorably discharged every just debt, stock or no stock. Have they ever done any thing to invalidate this presumption? It is true that at the instance of one member, a provision was inserted in the assignment that any surplus, after paying debts and indemnities, should be returned to the society.

To suppose that the Executive Committee really doubted that the American Anti-Slavery Society was able and would be willing to meet every just claim in an honorable manner, would be scarcely less than ludicrous. They might not do it with mercantile punctuality, but they knew that it would ultimately be done; no benevolent society ever met its payments with strict legal exactness. It is impossible in the nature of the case; because their resources depend on so many contributors; but is it not a most obvious remark, and applicable to the case of the Massachusetts pledge, that the same benevolent disposition which induces the original incurring of the obligation will induce its fulfilment, if fulfilment be possible? Have we not seen the A. B. C. F. M. shortening its remittances to all its stations? But was it negligence, or bad faith in them? By no means.

We now dismiss the matters connected with the late defection from this Society. It remains to say a word of the effect of this event upon the Anti-Slavery cause.

We have been pained by it, but we are not discouraged in the slightest degree. On the contrary, we feel that our moral force is augmented by our numerical loss. The alternative presented to us was to retain the disaffected or to retain the distinctive principles of an Anti-Slavery Society. That the body of Abolitionists had virtue and firmness enough to adhere to principles rather than to men, however heretofore prized, is itself best of omens for our cause. A severer trial is scarcely to be expected. At the result, we feel strengthened, animated, disembarrassed.

We have made the foregoing exposition, not for the purpose of reply to those who, professing to hope for peace and to hate crimination, attempt to give a mortal wound in nearly every sentence they have put forth on the subjects of this address. "And Joab said unto Amasa, 'Art thou in health my brother!' And Joab took Amasa by the beard, with his right hand, to kiss him. But Amasa took no heed to the sword in Joab's left hand; so he smote him in the fifth rib." We have made this development by order of the Society, to the end, that Abolitionists of this and of coming time, may understand the true causes of the alienation which has been consummated by the act of forming a new organization at New-York. We have made it principally to answer that demand of the true-hearted host, "Watchman, what of the night;" and we rejoice to respond in cheerful tones, "The morning cometh."

JAMES S. GIBBONS, *Chairman.*

JAMES C. JACKSON, *Secretary.*

* This was an error; it had been established two years when Mr. Phelps took the agency.

The extract from an unpublished Poem on our fourth page to-day, and the Doomed City in number five, are from a poet who will yet take his station among the first of New-England, we may say of our country.

We thank him for these favors and will receive more gladly.

Terms.

We call special attention to our terms on the first page.

Stephen Dickerson.

We announced last week the reclaiming of this young man from slavery, and promised to give the particulars this week. Stephen Dickerson was sold from the steamer Newcastle, by Capt. Wilson as were also Robert Garrison and Isaac Wright, at New Orleans, through the agency of a villain named Lewis, who was mate under Capt. Wilson. They were sold to a man named Botts, who sold them at auction to different persons, they having been previously beaten and whipped very severely to compel them to say that they were the property of the man who sold them, and to prevent them from mentioning New-York or any other free state.—Stephen was sold to a man named ——— ———, from whom he was reclaimed by free papers being sent him through the agency of lawyer Elwell, of New Orleans. The Sheriff, was sent to reclaim him, from a country place where he had been taken, who, upon his return to the city offered him for sale again, and was only prevented from selling him by the prompt attention of Mr. Elwell. After this he engaged on board a steamboat on the Mississippi; the man from whom he had been reclaimed hearing this, went on board and demanded of the captain that he should not allow Stephen to leave the boat until he had paid 200 dollars to complete his freedom, six hundred having been first charged, four hundred of which had been paid,—he and the captain compelling Stephen to give a note over his own signature for that amount. This plan also proved ineffectual and all the negociations rendered null and void by the prompt action of Mr. Elwell. He staid on board this boat two months, she being seized for debt, he lost his wages. He next engaged on board a Texian vessel, remained two months, for which time the captain refused to pay him. He finally succeeded in getting an opportunity to come home in a steamboat which arrived here on the 7th inst. Z.

—*Colored American.*

The King of Prussia.—Frederick William, it appears, is still living, notwithstanding the detailed accounts in the Paris papers of the time and circumstances of his death.—On the 5th instant, his Majesty continued to be in great danger.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

July 14th, 1840.

I have just returned from Cazenovia, where I lectured last evening. Sabbath evening E. C. Pritchett, the Corresponding Secretary of the New-York State Anti-Slavery Society gave a lecture, which I much admired. It was a close, logical, and able discourse. Mr. Pritchett in the afternoon of the Sabbath, preached for the Rev. Mr. Parker of the Free Church and took special pains to show up the absurdities of Non-Resistance. I do not blame him for his effort. I suppose Non-Resistants are not afraid of their doctrine. Mr. P. had a fine audience and I was glad of it. Though differing from Mr. P., I have no scruples about hearing all that can be said on matters of difference, while I claim the right to express my own opinions as respects *measures*. On Monday evening, as I stated above, I found myself before a good audience at half past 7 to 8, and I spoke till 10 o'clock. But one left the house, until I closed. My subject was slavery, in its moral aspect, its contrariety to the principles of the Government, its influence upon the Church, upon politics, upon commerce, upon the cause of Freedom abroad. Under my second head, I spoke of our divisions, the points of issue, the Women and the Non-Resistance question, the divine government scheme, its absurdity in the light of the 19th century, the third political party, &c. The spirits of the Abolitionists in Cazenovia is, as a general thing, kind.—Those that have awakened to the necessity of having a "*divine* origin" for this government in order effectually to abolish slavery, talk about as sensibly as did Myron Holley in his late communication in the "Friend of Man." No man that will not go the third party scheme is a proper member of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or ought to be called an Abolitionist. They are not content with the fact allowed them on all hands, that this government is the creature of the people. O no, that would allow them or any one else to stay at home from the election—as the last Speaker of the House of Representatives has declared his intention to do—because Mr. Van Buren's policy or Mr. Harrison's does not please him; but they must tell us that "civil government is an ordinance of God," and then by fear of the wrath of God, they can drive men to the polls. Once there, they of course cannot vote for either of the parties with their present candidates—they must vote for some body—for government, being God's ordinance must be sustained—and men *will* not write forty-two names for Electors for President, so some body must do it for them; therefore it must be settled before hand; and Mr. Birney and Earle are the men.

Now, I would not care a copper if all the voting Abolitionists in the country should vote for those men, except on one account, that of its *moral influence*—the influence of the example. I think it would be decidedly injurious, from the fact that it would show but little moral power. The moral influence which would attend the plan of each man voting his own ticket would be lessened by the appearance of a ticket around which men rallied as the members of a *party*. I think there is too much of a disposition among us to act in clans, and I would not increase willingly the prevalence of such a spirit. Still I feel no disposition to quarrel with those who think differently, were it not for the fact that they are not content with an allowance to pursue their way of abolishing slavery. They must denounce, and declare that every body who will not embrace their dogmas, is false to God and Human Rights, and are SHEER HYPOCRITES; for Myron Holly says that "TRUTH AND GOD BY SINCERITY (!) disable them from holding membership" with the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society. One would suppose that he had taken lessons of Ignatius Loyola, and had awoke from a sleep of a number of centuries. Now, whenever this spirit crosses my path it will find no peace; it matters not who advocates it; the more talented the man, the more necessity of showing him up, for it is beneath any man who lays any claim to dignity of character or goodness of heart. In Cazenovia the spirit has begun to show itself by decrying the abolitionism of the Editor of the Union Herald, because he dares to have a conscience, and as the spirit presses him, does his sympathy with us increase? He is a noble man, and edits one of the best journals in the country. His paper is gaining ground gradually, and he will live, I trust, to see it on a firm basis. He told me that henceforth he should speak out more boldly than he had done. Cazenovia is one of the most beautiful villages in Central New-York. It is situated upon the border of Lincklaen lake, a beautiful body of pure water about 6 miles in length, and from one half to one mile in breadth. The village is incorporated, and is in a very prosperous state. The Oneida and Genesee Conference Seminary is located in this village on a beautiful rise of ground. This institution, belonging to the Methodists, is in a prosperous state, under the care of the Rev. George G. Hapgood, formerly Principal of the Oswego Rensaeler Academy. Two papers are printed here—the Union Herald, mentioned above, and the Republican Monitor, a paper devoted to the interests of the Whig party. The effect of my lecture, I am told, will be good, inasmuch as nothing is wanting to turn the tide in our favor but a fair explanation of the cause of division. I am glad to see by the last Philanthropist that the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society did not cut their connection with us, because of any action on our part on the "Woman Question." Doct. Bailey, it seems, is not quite so conscientious as Rev. Charles W. Denison, "who was the first man to publish Mr. Garrison's Prospectus." The Doctor thinks he might make out to sit by the side of a woman, without a "new organization." One thing I am peculiarly pleased about. It is this: That, so far as comes within my knowledge, not a single old organizationist in this State, and they are neither "few or far between," will vote for Harrison or Van Buren. Hundreds will vote for Birney and Earle. Hundreds will scatter their votes or *stay at home*. One thing more—I venture to say that not a single clergyman from Maine to Ohio, who has manifested his sympathy with us so far as to be known as our friend, that will vote wrong. While we can quote the Rev'ds Blanchard and Rankin, both of whom go against us—as going for Harrison; and H. G. Ludlow, and his coadjutors apostatizing, and declaring that slaveholders were *good* Christians, and "brother Magill should preach in his pulpit;" while the New Hampshire clergy can draw forth letters declaring that "Church and individual action are the efficient means for the abolition of slavery," and that Anti-Slavery organizations are of no use—from such men as Gerrit Smith, who at the time he writes it, is *heading a third political party*.—While such scenes as these we witness, it is consoling to know that old original abolitionism goes to the depths of the human soul and stirs up the elements of humanity. It is cheering to know that our ranks stand firm and undaunted; and that daily accessions are made to our numbers. You find no such miserable stuff falling from the lips of our ranks as that letter of John Rankin. My soul looks upon such reasoning with "unspeakable disgust." What are we coming to? Save us, O God! for we sink in deep waters. If there was ever a time when the furnace was seven times heated, it is now. Every engine that can be used will be to force Abolitionists into the support of pro-slavery lawmakers or executors. There is no test more sure as respects a man's abolitionism, if he votes, than his action at the ballot-box. Then he strikes for his country, for free institutions, for LIBERTY throughout the world. Then you see his faith in God, his love of principle and his desire for its triumph with a thorough conviction of the safety of IMMEDIATISM, of its duty, of the necessity of political action for its success; the man who will put aside for any considerations is trampling on what he *deems right*, and ought to be "rebuked sharply." Of what avail is it, that his prayers are long as Daniel's, his songs of Freedom sweet as Heaven? His religion is as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. The Almighty cannot look upon such conduct with allowance. If I may be allowed to judge, I think Wm. Goodell and those who go with him will find enough else to do without trying to show that Wm. Lloyd Garrison has carried the Abolitionists of Mass. over to the Whig party. If those who read the "Friend of Man" are kept as true to principle as those who receive instruction from the pen of Garrison, I shall rejoice and be exceeding glad. All over this State almost, Abolition is in the toils of Politics, Religion, Divinity, Law, Political economy: all are ministering to the success of one of the two great parties—overgrown, unhealthy, corrupt, dangerous to the liberties of the country, they threaten to crush, by their own gravity, the hopes of millions. Was there ever a time more than now when rebuke should be prompt; when reproof should be faithful and abundant; when we should cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils; when there should be no concealment, no compromise; when we should live for truth and not for reward? Never. All the influences in existence that are opposed to man's freedom are concentrating. The church is in alliance with the state, the state and church with Slavery, all three seem determined to vie with each other in opposition to holiness. I cannot contemplate the aspect without horror. The deep and infamous conduct of the Methodist Episcopal church, the miserable conduct of the New School Presbyterian Church, tell me that God designs any other associated influences than those to overthrow Slavery. I am astonished at the position which Mr. Smith has taken. A church that has hung like the night mare upon our enterprise: that has followed us as an enemy to devour and destroy; that has watched for our haltings that she might rejoice, and gloried in our divisions, since her priests have been the prime movers; such a church as this is, under God to overthrow slavery. Not it! It is destined to be overthrown, and on its ruins—

"A church that shall own
Man as his Maker's image, and shall groan
In agony, when it sees him robbed of his spirit's beauty
Heart broken and ALONE,"

shall be erected, whose God is the Lord. Then, and not till then, will the church have influence. Then she may go forth to conquer Slavery, as she did in the days of Christ, to demolish IDOLATRY. Till that hour "hope deferred" will make Mr. Smith's heart sick. It is easy to perceive how ready men are to get away from their duty. How like a drowning man they will catch at straws. Any other place of repose than the bed of *thorns* on which they have been compelled to lie down. "New Organization" will furnish a refuge for the craven-hearted, for the bigoted, for the intolerant; for any and all who tired of the battle, want to cease from the contest, and find some way easier than the high way of truth. They are pledged body and soul to the defence of Sectarianism, though humanity welters in blood. "Help, Lord! for the godly man ceaseth, for the faithful fail from the children of men." Be not cast down, neither be ye discouraged. "The Lord is our defence: the God of Jacob is our refuge." "Why do the heathen rage, and why do the people imagine vain things? The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision." Then let us rejoice in the prospect of man's freedom, and work faithfully, so shall our home be in Heaven.

Ever yours,

J. C. JACKSON.

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1840.



The London Convention.

We have not received from our delegates to this body, any advices or papers relative to its deliberations, which we suppose may be attributed to the circumstance of the British Queen having sailed before it was known to them that our "STANDARD" had been unfolded to the breeze. We must, therefore, derive all the information we can, from incidental sources, from which we learn that the Convention adjourned, after being in session eleven days. Our friends, Garrison, Remond and Rogers, did not arrive in London until several days after it was organized. The question as to who should be admitted to take seats, had been settled so as to exclude women. One of the delegates of the American Anti-Slavery Society, Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia, being thus denied the right to which she was entitled, not only in her capacity as such, but as an Abolitionist, under the call of the Convention, her associates mentioned above, very properly declined taking their seats. Thus, the American Anti-Slavery Society, in the persons of its representatives, was denied the right of participation in the councils of that body!!

We cannot withhold the expression of our regret that the Convention thought proper to adopt an odious and proscriptive distinction at the very outset of its proceedings; a regret which, although not wholly independent of personal sympathy for our disfranchised sister and her associates, is yet based chiefly on a conviction that the character of its deliberations, tarnished by the presence of despotism in one form, will therefore avail itself less for its overthrow in another. Had the call of the Convention been addressed to men only, or had it been stated that its organization would be determined by the usages of London, we had known what course to pursue. The American Abolitionists would as soon think of abolishing negro slavery by the substitution of white in the place of colored subjects, as of admitting a rule which would deny to any part of their own number, rights which belong to the whole. We feel that out brethren in England have acted unwisely for the object of the Convention, and unkindly toward us. We know of no law, we are cognizant of no principles, by which this exclusive and proscriptive action can be authorized. Was not the call issued for a *World's* Convention? Were not the American Abolitionists strongly solicited to send a large delegation? Aye, it was the declared wish of our English brethren, that our representation should take the lead in a measure in which we are so deeply interested; a measure which was intended to have a direct and special influence upon the institutions and destinies of our own country. Our late Annual Meeting, which was composed of the *elite* of American intelligence and humanity, thought proper to name among its delegates, a woman, eminently qualified by ability and experience to discharge every duty connected with the missson. The appointment was in accordance with our usages; and was it culpable in us to suppose that, being invited to send delegates, we might *ourselves choose whom to send?* It was a World's Convention that was to meet, and, as a *part of the World*, we had a *right* to be represented by a delegation of our own choice. That the participation of women in public meetings is unknown in England, is no reason why we should be denied the exercise of this inalienable right. England is not the *world*, nor is America, or France!

Freedom, hitherto fettered by conditions no more reasonable or just than that which has deprived the American Anti-Slavery Society of a voice in the World's Convention, looks forward with a certainty to a time, that surely is not far distant, when these will be abolished. She sees in them, in the forms and customs of society that has grown up under enslaving influences, a great obstacle to her progress. Ever yet, the preference is asserted for aristocratic usage, and not a chain falls from humanity, but tyrant custom pleads and fights for its endurance. The Anti-Slavery mind of America asserts, and will maintain the rightful precedence of Freedom over despotism in every form. It will not be fettered by conditions, however sanctified by time, that exist on a basis kindred with that of the accursed system of negro slavery. It will know hereafter, when called upon to send a delegation 3000 miles, over sea and land, whether the body of which it is solicited to constitute a part, is to be a World's Convention, or only *half* a World's Convention.

The Address.

In our next number we shall have more room to give the proceedings of the London Convention. We are limited this week by the publication of the address of the Executive Committee. We ask for this document a careful and attentive perusal.

It is absolutely necessary for us to be thus particular in our review of the past history of the division. We are contending for great principles—the enlistment of so many generous and noble souls in our cause is attributable solely to the power of those principles upon which the American Anti-Slavery Society rests. Had the avowal of them at first been less distinct and Catholic, we never should have made the progress we have; and now that a trial has been made to dilute them, it is incumbent upon us to make clear so far as we can the real character and intentions of the attempt.

Some we know are disposed to let the past sleep, but this feeling arises from an overweening confidence in those who have been wrong in this matter.

Let the new organizationists abandon their groundless and wicked charges against us—let them cease to propagate them with the determination to render our society odious, and we have nothing to say. But while no stone is left unturned to forestall opinions by false misrepresentations—while with the sound of peace and conciliation on their lips, they proceed to strike blows at our existence. We must and shall protect what we are appointed sentinels over. Do not deride this exposure of the real state of affairs as unwise and meddling with that which is foreign to our object. Whatever concerns the integrity of the Anti-Slavery enterprise is not foreign to our purpose, fellow laborers. We are pledged to each other—to our country, to the world, to strive for the peaceful overthrow of American slavery. Can we suffer charges then to be preferred against us by those who, from the very position they have occupied, will challenge credence? The charges are just or unjust. There are those who have given time and money, and, by the dint of toilsome labor, have aided in building up the Anti-Slavery enterprise, who in their remote localities from the immediate field of action, are desirous of the facts, the why and the wherefore. They ought to know the real nature of the difficulties. Why they are called upon to cease for a while from perfecting the superstructure to take care of the base. Let us see that the foundations of the temple we are erecting are laid deep and broad, so that the winters of selfishness shall not heave them. We cannot always expect to be engaged in decorating and adorning the beautiful arches and stately columns, we must be content to see the humbler occupations of carrying stone and mortar go on.

Great principles lie imbedded deep in the human mind and heart; there is much of superstition, bigotry, and selfishness, to be moved before they will appear clear to all. We must be content and cheerful to perform the work before us, whether flowers or thorns strew our pathway.

The Temple of Liberty shall go up, and gather within its wide-spreading portals all of every clime, sex, and complexion.

The Debate on Admission of Delegates.

The remarks of Wendell Phillips and others which we give below, will show in what manner the delegation from the American Anti-Slavery Society were excluded from the London Convention. Mr. Phillips, Professor Adam, (of Harvard University,) George Bradburn, and Isaac Winslow, of Massachusetts, Charles C. Lester, of New-York, James Mott of Pennsylvania, and Col. J. P. Miller, of Vermont, presented their protest. It was laid upon the table.

William Lloyd Garrison, Nathaniel P. Rogers, and Chas. L. Remond, did not arrive until six days after the opening of the Convention, but as one of our delegation, Lucretia Mott, who was present, had been refused a seat, and several from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania also, according to the usages of London, and not according to the usage of the great body of American Abolitionists, who had been specially invited to be present and take seats, they showed a proper respect for themselves and their constituents at home, not to give in their adhesion.

The assertion, that a small portion of Abolitionists, in America only, regard women as members of the Anti-Slavery Society, is not true. New England certainly contains a considerable body of Abolitionists, and a very small portion are organized on an exclusive platform there. Ohio and Pennsylvania are worthy to be mentioned in a Convention in England, and they have never excluded woman. In truth, we know not the State that has done so; and yet it was gravely stated in the Convention, by clergymen and others, from this country, that only a small portion of the Abolitionists favored their acting as members of Anti-Slavery Societies.

But it is sufficient to state the fact,—THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *was not represented in the World's Convention.*

A World's Convention will be assembled, whose dimensions will include a representation from the American Anti-Slavery Society. Such women as Lucretia Mott, Maria Weston Chapman, Ann Phillips and Lydia Maria Child, will be admitted as members: and the land of Hannah Moore, Elizabeth Fry and Harriet Martineau, will yet acknowledge women to be possessed of souls and minds.

Mr. Wendell Phillips said, Those who may have watched the proceedings of this Convention during the presence of Thomas Clarkson, Esq. will have observed, that we have not yet provided for the formation of any roll of membership.—There is no body constituted emanating from this Convention to receive the credentials of delegates, and inscribe their names. Several friends who are interested in the matter have proposed to make a motion to that effect, in the regular course of business, but it was suggested that as it might lead to discussion, it would be better to delay it till after the retirement of our venerated friend. I make these remarks to apologise for the seeming inappropriateness of the motion which I have to submit to the meeting. It is as follows—

"That a committee of five be appointed to prepare a correct list of the members of this Convention, with instructions to include in such list all persons bearing credentials from any Anti-Slavery body."

It may be necessary before I sit down to state the reason of making that motion, when to all appearance there exists on this table a list of delegates. I do it because, coming from the State of Massachusetts there are several of my co-delegates, who though in this hall, have not received an entrance as members of the Convention by the authority of the committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, who have undertaken to settle the qualifications of membershrp of this body. Under their control the list before me has been formed—a list very useful for the purposes of reference or communication between the various members who have arrived in this city. But some of us feeling ourselves, shall I use too harsh a term when I say aggrieved!—by this act of the committee, have thought it our duty to bring the subject before the Convention. I allude to the refusal of tickets of admission to the women of Massachusetts. When the call, which was read by Mr. Tredgold, reached America, we found that it was an invitation to the friends of the slave of every nation and of every clime. Massachusetts has for several years acted on the principle of admitting women to an equal seat with men in the deliberative bodies of Anti-Slavery societies. When the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery society received that paper it interpreted it as it was its duty, in the broadest and most liberal sense. If there be any other paper emanating from this committee, limiting to one sex the qualification of membership, there is no proof, and as an individual I have no knowledge, that such a paper ever reached Massachusetts. We stand here in consequence of your invitation, and knowing our custom, as it must be presumed you did, we had a right to interpret "friends of the slave" to include women as well as men. (Applause, and loud cries of no, no.) In such circumstances we do not think it just or equitable to that state, nor to America in general, that after the trouble, the sacrifice, the self-devotion of a part of those who leave their families, and kindred, and occupations in their own land, to come 4000 miles to attend this world's Convention, they should be refused a place in its deliberations. The meeting will observe that I have purposely introduced into the motion language which brings the question before the Convention.

Professor Adam (of Harvard University) in seconding the resolution said, I shall merely state that I have great pleasure in expressing my entire concurrence in the sentiments that have now been stated to the meeting. I will only add, if the ladies who have come from America are not deemed entitled in consequence of the credentials they bear to a place in this assembly, I feel for one that I am not entitled to occupy such a position. My credentials proceed from the same persons, and from the same societies, and bear the same names as theirs. I have no other authority to appear amongst you, to take a place in your proceedings, and give a voice in your deliberations, than that right which is equally possessed by the ladies to whom a place among you has been denied. In the society from which I have come, female exertion is the very life of us, (applause) and of all that we have done, and all we hope to do. To exclude them, therefore, would be to affix a stigma upon them. (Cries of no, no.)

Mr. George Stacey, I feel that any one is placed in a very invidious position in having to speak a word in reference to this proposition. It is inconsistent with our natural feelings to take a part which shall at all throw a stigma or shade of unfavorable opinion upon the conduct, exertions, influence, or power of our female friends in this cause. I believe no persons are disposed to estimate more highly than the committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, the bright example and philanthropic efforts of our female friends. But the custom of this country is well known and uniform. In all matters of mere business, unless females are especially associated together and announced as such in the promotion of the objects in view, they do not become a part of the working committees. Having been a member of the society from that invitation issued, and having taken a constant part in its proceedings, I feel myself in some degree qualified to bear testimony to the meaning of such documents as it has issued, and I do take the liberty of saying that, to my knowledge, the document calling the Convention had no reference to, or ever contemplated including females as a part of the Convention (Hear, hear.) We did become aware in the progress of this business that there was a disposition on the part of our American brethren, and that with the best intention, to construe that call as it might have been construed had it been issued by themselves—that is, that it might include females as well as men. The earliest moment that this circumstance came to the knowledge of the committee, that committee issued another circular, which bears date the 15th of February, in which the description of those who are to form the Convention is set forth as consisting of gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) We thus felt that we had done all we could to prevent inconvenience to our American friends on this subject, and supposed that we should not have been brought into difficulty with this question. But as this point has been introduced, I take it for granted, that sooner or later the opinion of the Convention must be taken as to whether or not ladies are to become a part of the Convention. I would waive some points with respect to its operation; for I think that the sooner the matter is brought to a conclusion, the better.

Dr. Bowring—I think the custom of excluding females is more honoured in its breach than in its observance. In this country sovereign rule is placed in the hands of a female, and one who has been exercising her great and benignant influence in opposing slavery, by sanctioning, no doubt, the presence of her illustrious consort, at an Anti-Slavery meeting. We are associated with a body of christians, who have given to their women a great, honourable, and religious prominence. I look upon this delegation from America as one of the most interesting, the most encouraging, and the most delightful symptoms of the times. I hope that a committee will be appointed to consider this question, and to report on the facts of the case. I cannot believe that we shall refuse to welcome gratefully the co-operation which is offered to us.

The Rev. J. Burnet—I feel that, if there ever was a time when it was necessary for this Convention to be calm and self-collected this is that moment. I have no hesitation in saying, that I feel that the Convention itself is periled in this discussion, and whilst I have the highest regard for the ladies of America and England, and whilst neither for the one nor for the other can I entertain for one moment any feeling but a feeling of the highest respect, I must at the same time claim your indulgence and that of the meeting, while I take a calm and deliberate view of the question, one of the most important that can be discussed in connexion with the mere forms of this Convention. We must be calm, and we must be firm; and I shall be as firm in the maintenance of my sentiments, as I shall be calm in the statement of them. (Cheers.) The gentleman who has proposed the motion, which is now before you, stated his case very well and very calmly, and very fairly stated the claims which the ladies have to the kind consideration of all for their works of usefulness, and their energy in these works. We hail the continuance of their work of usefulness; we thank them for the past, we trust them in the present, and we anticipate great things from them in the future. (Applause.) I would apply this to England as well as to America. The ladies of England are active and diligent in all the works of benevolence—applause—they have frequently stimulated to the creation of such institutions as this, when the lords of creation did not think of creating them. (Applause.) The ladies have carried them on when the gentlemen would have found it impossible, from the multiplicity of demands made on their time by the business in which they are engaged. In one thing said by the gentleman I cordially concur. He contended for putting an American interpretation upon American phraseology; certainly, so he ought, but he ought also, upon the same principle, to put an English interpretation upon English phraseology—(Cheers and laughter.)—I must be allowed to say that it never did occur to the society that it was inviting ladies from any part of the globe; it never was contemplated that the resolutions of the committee could be so construed. It has come upon us by surprise, without any anticipation. Is it fair that we should be called upon now to discuss such a question, when we never for a moment anticipated even such a contingency? I must say, that it is unfair that we should be called upon to do so, that no indignity was offered, or intended to be offered, to the ladies—they were placed on a level with our own wives and daughters—(cheers)—and if they are placed in such a position, it is impossible to say that any insult or indignity was offered, or could be offered, to them. I would welcome those ladies to this hall with pleasure—to that part of it to which they may be admitted with propriety. I would treat them with all attention, with all respect, but I would not clothe them with the character of officers of the Convention. It would be better that this Convention should be at this moment dissolved, than that the resolutfon should be adopted. (Cries of "No, no.") Some gentlemen say no, no, I wish them to think upon it seriously and gravely. If this Convention should take the course proposed by the mover and seconder of the resolution, I am convinced, that it will sincerely regret it. I should say that our American friends would add another laurel to their brow, were they at this moment to say, let us not at this moment make shipwreck of our vessel, let us not even put her in a perilous sea. (Applause.) As we are in England, let us act as England does.

The Rev. Mr. Grew said, the invitation was understood by many in the sense to which reference had been made, but the admission of females to form a party of the Convention did not accord with his views of propriety.

The Rev. Mr. Colver felt bound to say that there was a very large portion of the brethren in America who upon this question thought as the English did, and had it not been understood that the English principle would be acted upon, many of them would not have been there.

Mr. Stacey thought that it would not be advisable to go into the abstract question. It was time to have a substantive resolution before them. He would therefore move as an amendment,

"That this Convention, upon a question arising as to the admission of females appointed as delegates from America to take their seats in this body, resolve to decide this question in the negative."

The Rev. Mr. Galusha, of New-York, in seconding the amendment, said, he was a delegate from an exceedingly numerous constituency in America, and amongst them the ladies took no part in the business of societies. He could say that it was a very small minority of the Abolitionists who had allowed the innovation, and it ought not to be acted upon here. He had no objection to women being the neck to turn the head about, but he had no wish to see them assume the place of the head. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. Dr. Rolfe, (from Canada,) approved of the amendment. The question was one on which America was not decided. Why then should this Convention be called to the invidious task of deciding between the two contending parties?

Mr. G. Bradburn, of the legislature of Massachusetts, hoped that the original motion would have been agreed to without any discussion. He did not anticipate any difference of opinion upon such a question in that which was a World's Convention. That was a Convention of Abolitionists from all parts of the world. Then were the delegates of Massachusetts to be debarred the priviledge—the right of sending the delegates of their own election? It would no longer be a world's Convention, if such freely chosen delegates were to be excluded.—(Hear.) It had been said if the women were admitted they would take sides. Why had they not as good a right to take sides as the men!—(Hear, hear.)

Colonel Miller then rose to address the meeting, but

The Chairman suggested that it would be advisable to have the second letter of invitation explaining the basis on which the Conventron had been called, read, which was accordingly done by the Secretary.

Colonel Miller then proceeded. He fortunately belonged to a state in America that had never been troubled with the woman question.—(Hear, hear, and laughter.) The women were among their primeval Abolitionists, and had been merely seconded by their husbands This question ought never to have come here to have been settled, but ought to have been decided on their own shores. The women had been duly delegated in the cause of humanity. He did not claim for them pre-eminence over man, but would merely observe that they were first in their attendance at the cross, and first and last at the sepulchre, and that from that day to this they had taken the van in the march of civilized liberty.—(Cheers.) He only wanted a fair and honorable expression of the opinion of the meeting, and to that opinion he pledged himself that the delegates from America would bow.—(Hear, hear.)

Captain Stuart was persuaded, having been in the United States and being largely acquainted with the great body of Abolitionists, that in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, the most uncompromising friends of liberty and of the slaves were against the reception of lady delegates, as recommended.

Mr. William Allen urged the assembly to consider the value of the cause they were all met to promote, and he regretted that a question of this sort had ever been mooted.—(Hear, hear, hear.) It might be a subject of grave and proper consideration at another time and in another place, but he thought the introduction of the question into that assembly would merely prove an apple of discord.

Mr. George Thompson claimed the attention of the Convention for a few moments, because the present question was one upon which he thought the fate of the Convention, for all good purposes, hinged.—(Hear, hear.) He had deprecated most sincerely the introduction of the question into the Convention. He had anticipated it with dread; and although they were not in a situation to retrace their steps, yet they had it in their power to avert the consequences that must inevitably ensue, if they became partizans in this matter; and if, in consequence of their recorded votes, they should regard their friends, with whom alone they could associate or be useful, as enemies. He had listened attentively to the arguments of Mr. Burnet, one of our best controversialists, and what were those arguments! First, that English phraseology must be construed according to English usages; secondly, that it was never contemplated by the Anti-Slavery committee of that society, that ladies should occupy a seat in the Convention; thirdly, that the ladies of England were not there as delegates; and fourthly, that neither he, nor any other individual, had a desire to offer an affront, still less an insult to the ladies. Those, he presumed, were the strongest arguments Mr. Burnet could urge, and in opposition to them, he (Mr. Thompson) would observe, that there were present ladies who presented themselves as delegates from known societies—the originators of all the other societies in America. He had expected that Mr. Burnet, if he had intended to offer a successful opposition to their introduction, would have grappled with the constitutionality of their credentials—would have gone to the question of title, and disputed the right of the Pennsylvania assembly to send ladies to the Convention. Those ladies came as the representatives of two millions and a half of slaves, and he would implore gentlemen in voting upon this question to remember that in admitting or rejecting them, they acknowledged or despised their constituents.—(Hear, hear, and No, no.) The grand objection that had been taken was, that, if admitted, the ladies would be placed upon a footing of equality with themselves, and that that equality would be contrary to custom, usage, and principle. That was a flimsy excuse for their exclusion. They had advocated the cause of the poor slave, and suffered much for his sake, before their opponents were known as Abolitionists. (Cheers.) He could not understand the ground upon which they were to be excluded. It could not be on the ground of intellect, principle, or discretion. Their conduct in the Anti-Slavery cause had been above all praise, and while they had carried their flag in the van, the men had most humbly and obsequiously followed in the rear.—(Cheers and laughter.) The State of Massachusetts had heard Angelina Grimke, the female delegate of the Anti-Slavery society, and she was commended for that course. The most useful societies in America were those conducted by women. As to the propriety of the thing he had his own opinion, and had laboured to the eleventh hour to prevent the question being mooted here. (Loud cries of Hear, hear.) Even now he should be glad if it were thought proper to withdraw it. (Hear, hear.) It was said that if they rejected not the ladies they would regret it. Why? On account of magnanimity or gentlemanly feeling? (Hear, hear.) He yet apprehended the greatest difficulties from a division—(hear, hear)—and perhaps the sense of the meeting could be taken without, and a protest entered. But upon the question coming thus distinctly forward he thought he should be recreant to all that was generous had he forborne to say what he had. For the appearance of some of the ladies he was answerable—he had written, inviting them but confessed he did not then anticipate that they would come as delegates. (Hear, hear.) He earnestly requested his American friends to withdraw their motion.

Mr. G. Stacey withdrew his amendment, trusting that the original motion would also be withdrawn; and if not the Convention would have to decide it, yea or nay.

Mr. W. Phillips could not take upon himself the responsibility of withdrawing the resolution. (Loud cries of question and divide.) It was with him a matter of conscience.

The Chairman said that Mr. Phillips having exercised his right of replying, he was now about to put the question.

Several delegates here rose together to protest against the question being now put.

Mr. Phillips said he had not risen to reply, but merely to explain.

The Chairman said that such being the case the discussion must be allowed to continue.

Mr. Caines, of Edinburgh, then rose to address the meeting, and said that he had to propose an amendment, which he hoped would have the effect of settling this question, without offending the feelings of any party. The amendment he proposed to submit was to the following effect:—

"That this Convention finds itself placed in a state of great perplexity by the claims of the female delegates from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, to be received as delegates to the Convention. That it regrets that, according to the terms of the invitation, it cannot receive them as such; whilst at the same time it takes this opportunity of expressing its admiration of the zeal which has induced them to undertake a voyage of 4,000 miles, in order to be present on this occasion." (Cheers.)

Mr. Ashurst said it did not matter what were the intentions of the committee in issuing the invitation; the question was as to what their intentions ought to have been.—This was a convention met together on the principles of universal benevolence, and they ought to welcome all who came there for the purpose of carrying those principles into effect; and from such a meeting assembled on such principles they were now about to exclude the women of America, and this they called acting on principles of universality. They profess to act on principles of universality, and were about to commence their proceedings by disfranchising one half of creation. Women were as competent as men to understand, and to guard every thing connected with Christianity, and to bring forth the best qualities of our nature. Let them look at the argument on the other side; it was contended that the invitation of the committee should be construed according to the customs of the country in which they were to assemble. Now what would have been the case if the Convention had assembled in Virginia? It would be said that by law and custom slavery existed in that State, and that, therefore, they had no right to set themselves in opposition to the prejudices and customs of society, by attempting to put it down. (Cries of "No, no.") The Anti-Slavery cause was under the greatest obligations to the exertions of women, and yet they were going to begin their first Convention by disfranchising their constituency, as one half of creation. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Mr. Harvey, of Glasgow, regretted that the question had been brought before the meeting. The Convention was now called upon not to come to a decision as to the slavery question, but to come to a decision on the question of the rights of females. (Cheers.) He would yield to no man in the high estimation he felt for the female character. No man appreciated more highly than himself the kindness, the zeal, and the disinterested benevolence of the female character, none had labored more effectively than they had done in the Anti-Slavery cause. (Cheers.) But he doubted whether in such a meeting as the present females were in their own proper sphere—(cheers)—and if the question of the admission should be pressed to a division, he would certainly give his most decided opposition to it. (Cheers.) It had been stated by some of the delegates from America, that this was with them a question of conscience—why, it was a question of conscience with him too. He entertained certain views on this subject, with regard to the word of God, and he thought and conscientiously believed that, if he gave his vote for admitting females to vote and speak in such an assembly as the present, he should be acting in opposition to what he considered the word of God—(cheers.) But while he said this, he at the same time must express his admiration of the devotedness, the heroism, and the enlightened zeal which they had exhibited in their endeavors to ameliorate the unhappy condition of the slave, and he would hold them up as an example to the women of Britain for the devotedness which they had displayed to effect this object. (Cheers.)

The Rev. J. A. James, of Birmingham, had not been an indifferent nor an inactive spectator, so far as he could observe the cause from the shores of his own country, of the progress of the cause of the abolition of slavery in America. Such had been the impression formed upon his mind of the exertions of those females of whose names America might be justly proud, that he would willingly have undertaken a journey to town had it been only to see such women as Mrs. Chapman and Mrs. Weld. But he was quite sure that, in that assembly that morning, the moving the question of their admission had been prejudicial to the cause. He was sorry the abstract question of the rights of women had occupied so large a share of their attention. He regretted that the question had been brought from the other side of the Atlantic. (Cheers.) It would have been better to have settled it there first—(loud cheers)—and have allowed them to pursue their own course without embarrassing them on the subject. (Loud cheers.) Several expressions had been made use of by the gentlemen from America in the course of the discussion, which he had been delighted to hear. He was pleased with the declaration of Col. Miller, that, whatever might be the decision of the majority of the Convention, to that he was prepared to bow; and though, as Mr. Phillips could not conscientiously consent to withdraw his resolution, the question must go to the vote, yet he thought, however, they might give their votes, it would occasion no divisions among them; but that they would all be prepared to go forward in the great and good work which they had undertaken with perfect confidence in each other's motives, though they had not the same confidence in each other's opinions. (Loud cheers.) They had never before heard a single word on the question of the right of females. It was a question perfectly new in this country. They were not prepared for its discussion. It had never been mooted, and they were therefore not prepared to jump to a conclusion. The question involved in this country far wider considerations than even the question of slavery itself—(hear, hear, and cheers)—and he trusted that they would not gratify their enemies by quarrelling on the threshold. (Loud cheers.) He was sure the American delegates would stand acquitted at the bar of their own country of any imputation of luke-warmness on this question. (Cheers.) The females could never reproach them with having deserted their cause, and they would go back honored by all those who had sent them there—and should they one day agree with their American friends in opinion on this subject, then would they welcome those females within the bar who were now placed a little beyond it, but whom he could not think disgraced by being so placed. (Cheers.) No man could have read "The Martyr Age," which to him possessed more than the charms of romance, without forming the highest opinion of the devotedness, the talents, and the heroism of the women of America. (Cheers.) America was the only country in the world which could boast a very extensive martyrology to this cause, and they would add another laurel to their wreaths by conceding the point under discussion. (Cheers.) They would still continue to appear in this first meeting of the sort which had ever been assembled since slavery first existed, and be with them and around them, although they could not be amongst them. He hoped that all that had occurred on this question would be only like what sometimes was introduced into the most melodious music, a discord only to make the harmony the sweeter. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Caine's amendment not having been seconded, it fell to the ground, and the Chairman was about to put the original resolution, when

Mr. Stacey said, that he had only consented to withdraw his amendment, upon the understanding that Mr. Phillips would consent to withdraw his original motion! but that gentleman having declined, it was not competent for him to do so. He, (Mr. Stacey,) would not withdraw his amendment. (Loud cries of "question, question: divide, divide.")

The Chairman said, that as the great majority of the meeting seemed to wish to come to a decision on the subject, he would now put the question.

Dr. Cox protested against this peremptory decision of the Chairman. It was not competent for any number of gentlemen to demand of the Chairman that he should come to a prompt decision on this subject. (cheers.) Gentlemen on the other side of the question were entitled to be heard, and if they were not heard, he should move an adjournment.

Mr. J. Canning Fuller said, that he represented as large a constituency as any one present, and he was surprised that an attempt should be made to prevent persons from speaking. It had been said that the question ought to have been settled on the other side the Atlantic. Why, it had been settled in favor of the women a year ago; and with regard to the terms of the invitation, there was nothing about gentlemen in the first invitation, and the women had been elected before the second notice had been received.

Captain Walker said, that in whatever country an institution was formed, something should be given up to the feelings and prejudices of the country in which it was formed. (cheers.) The ladies across the Atlantic had exerted themselves nobly, (cheers,)—and he trusted they would continue to do so, (loud cheers,—but he entreated the ladies not to push this question. (cheers.) They did not perhaps fully comprehend the feeling existing in this country on the subject. (cheers.) The question reduced itself to this.—Were the Americans willing to cast off England altogether? England had given a proof of her sincerity in the Anti-Slavery cause by paying twenty millions to get rid of the abomination of slavery, and were they now willing to cast England off? If the society had been established in America, he should never have mooted the question of the exclusion of the females; he would do nothing to offend the prejudices of the country in which they were, and he trusted they would do nothing calculated to cripple the great cause in which they were engaged. (cheers.)

Mr. Birney, Secretary of the National Anti-Slavery Society of New-York, said that he rose for the purpose of correcting an impression which might be produced upon the minds of the Convention, by what had fallen from some of the preceding speakers from the United States, and also from Mr. G. Thompson. Those gentlemen had made use of expressions calculated to produce the impression that the woman question, as it was called, was considered settled in the United States. Now, such was by no means the case. It was still a moot question, and a question which, since he had left America, had led to a split in the Anti-Slavery Society, and to the organization of a new one, from which females, he had no doubt, would be excluded. It was true, the question had been decided in their favor last year, but that decision had been come to, by no means by a large majority, and a portion of that majority was made up by the females themselves. Again, in Massachusetts, this principle had been a principal ground of separation between the societies. On both sides the question, however, were to be found good Abolitionists and true. In Massachusetts a separation had taken place—one society admitted females, the other did not. Since he had left New-York, he had heard from his friend, Lewis Tappan, on the subject. In a committee of which he was a member, the name of a distinguished Abolitionist, Mrs. Child, had been placed on the committee. She was at a distance from the place, and consequently unable to attend, and Mr. Tappan had moved that the name of her husband, Mr. Child, a most talented man should be substituted. This proposition, however, was negatived, and another lady, Miss Kelly, elected in the room of Mrs. Child. In consequence of this Mr. Tappan and several of his friends had come to a resolution to separate from the society on that ground. Besides, most of those who were for the rights of women were also in favor of what was called the no-human government system. (Hear, hear.) He had only given this account in order to enable the Convention to come to an intelligent decision on the subject.—(cheers.)

Mr. Birney and Mr. Thompson severally explained.

The Rev. C. Stovel said the whole question was now rather one of order than anything else. They were assembled there together from all parts of the world to consider questions relating to negro slavery; but whilst they were discussing the powers of the delegates, they were called upon to decide a question of a totally different character—a question of which they had never before heard anything—the question of the rights of women. He would not withhold from them any of their rights—he would give them more than their rights—he thought men, and women too, would be but poorly off if they had nothing but their rights. If that question was tearing the societies in pieces in the United States, why should they introduce it to tear in pieces this Convention? (loud cheers.) He considered the introduction of the question was decidedly out of order, and he should vote for the confirmation of the list of delegates as handed in by the Committee, and henceforth he hoped they would entertain this question no more. (cheers.) Were they not met together, pledged to do something against slavery, and they suffer the tide of benevolence to be stopped by a straw? They had assembled for the destruction of slavery, and they ought not to expose themselves to ridicule through the whole length and breadth of the land. He should move, as an amendment, that the list of delegates, as taken by the Committee, should be adopted. (cheers.)

Mr. Prescott, of Barbadoes, rose, not for the purpose of discussing the question, but of stating a fact. The ladies themselves had not come over with any very certain expectation of being received among them. (cheers.) He had had that fact from the ladies themselves. The ladies had been elected conditionally, if their reception should be in accordance with the customs of the country: and if it were not so, they were absolved from all responsibility.

The Rev. Mr. Bevan protested against private conversations being repeated before a public assembly.

Mr. Prescott resumed. The conversation which took place last night was not a private one; they had a preliminary meeting, at which persons, not delegates, were present. He stated this in the presence of the American delegates, and of the ladies themselves. (Loud cries of "order, order."

The Chairman said the speaker was decidedly out of order in giving the details of private conversation; he had clearly no right to do so. (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. Morison said they were already on the brink of a precipice. The discussion of this question had already given rise to feelings not only adverse to the object for which they were assembled, but to that christian spirit by which all previous anti-slavery meetings had been actuated—(Cheers)—for whatever had been done in this country in the anti-slavery cause had been done under the guidance of Christian principles. They were firm-minded men on both sides of this question. It was a question of conscience between the two parties, but he would say it was a question of conscience between a small minority on one side, and a mighty majority on the other. He might discuss this question until the convention was broken up—but would their American friends indulge any hope of carrying this question if it should be put to the vote of the meeting?—(Cheers.) He believed if their American friends could be induced to withdraw the motion unanimity would be secured. They had assembled to discuss the question of Anti-Slavery, and they were now asked to discuss another, and that a minor question, as to the admission of female delegates from a small section of the American continent. He besought them calmly to consider the position in which the discussion of that question was placing them that day.—(Hear.) The present was unlike any meeting that had hitherto been held in England. All former Anti-Slavery meetings in England had been unanimous. (Cheers.) Would their American brethren keep them in their present position? Besides, he thought it improper that this discussion should be carried on in the presence of the ladies, for whom he entertained the most profound respect. (Loud cheers.) He knew the feelings of the Americans on this subject. He knew how anxious the discussion of this question in their own country had made them, and now they were making the friends of the anti-slavery cause as anxious on the subject on this. (Cheers.) He was convinced they did not admire the position females occupied in this country, or they would never have mooted this question. He urged them to proceed immediately to the division in a spirit of christian charity, and to abide by the decision (Loud cheers.)

The Chairman said the hour was too late, that he should now call upon Mr. Phillips to reply.

Mr. Phillips would not enter on a reply. He would simply deny the truth of the assertions of Mr. Prescott, that the women did not expect to be received when they came there, or that they had any liberty left them of choice. The women of Massachusetts had no such liberty of choice left them, and they would have been coming to that Convention with a lie in their mouths, and have been guilty of the grossest deception if, having such liberty, they had come before the Convention in the way they had done. The particulars of that conversation had been greatly exaggerated. It was not true that the rent in the American societies had been owing to the introduction of the woman question; his friend, who had made that assertion, had been misinformed on the subject. It was political action which had occasioned that split, and not the introduction of the woman question. He, for one, was not a favorer of the no-human government plan; and he knew many strenuous supporters of the rights of women who, like himself, were by no means favorable to that scheme. (Cheers.)

The question was then put, and Mr. Stacey's amendment carried by a large majority. The announcement of the result was received with loud cheering.

Mr. G. Thompson hoped that, as the question was now decided, it would never again be brought forward, and that the Convention would proceed with the same good feeling as if nothing had occurred to disturb their unanimity.—(cheers.)

Mr. Phillips said that he did not doubt but that the supporters of his motion would co-operate with the Convention with just the same cordiality as if it had been carried. All they asked was an expression of opinion on the subject, and having obtained that, they would go on with them with a perfect feeling of cordiality. (Loud cheers.)

Professor Adam would co-operate with the gentlemen around him, with as much zeal and earnestness as if this question had never been started.

On the motion of Mr. Sturge, the Convention then adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Office of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

All orders for publications, and all letters in relation to the business department of the Standard, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER, 143 Nassau-street. All communications for publication in the Standard should be superscribed to the "Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard," 143 Nassau-street, N. Y.

Subscribers to the Emancipator.

Those individuals who subscribed for the Emancipator, as the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society for the current year, are informed that by making known to our Publishing Agent their preference for this, and their post office address, shall receive the Standard gratuitously for the time they have paid for the Emancipator.

POETRY.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

An Extract from an unfinished Poem.

Cruel, self throned oppressors! if you must
Hold over man your tyrannous controul,
Then trample down his body to the dust;
But never dare to touch the immortal soul—
That link mysterious which binds to God
Its moving tenement, the mortal clod.

It is a "holy and a deathless thing"—
Which hands unhallowed may not guiltless touch.
When to the dust his godlike form ye bring,
Pause lest ye tempt Jehovah's wrath too much
That he for vengeance bares his red right hand
To deal destruction on a groaning land.

Already have ye won a damning shame
To our fair honor and the black disgrace,
That shrouds in foul eclipse our sinking fame,
Like a dark phantom haunts from place to place,
Our wandering sons, from India's glowing clime,
To distant Laplands everlasting rime.

And our fair land to foul oppression given,
Ripe to the harvest of God's wrath; even now
Stands forth condemned before all earth and heaven,
"*Destruction*" written on her shameless brow;
And O, perchance the archangel now doth stand,
Prepared to reap, waiting the dread command.

While hovering vengeance o'er our guilty nation,
High in the chambers of the thunder throned,
Holds the red bolts of utter desolation,
To blast our glory, till our crimes atoned,
No more shall call the ruin from on high,
That lowers terrific in our darkening sky.

O, then Columbians! from your favored land,
Indignant spurn the foul oppressors rod,
Nor dare to war with *deicidal* hand
Against the throne and majesty of God,
Or soon the fearful doom shall be revealed
"*Thy days are numbered thy destruction sealed.*"

* S *

Meditation.

"And they said one to another, Did not our hearts burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?" Luke xxiv. 32.

Hath not thy heart within thee burned
At evening's calm and holy hour,
As if its inmost depths discerned
The presence of a loftier power!

Hast thou not heard, 'mid forest glades
While ancient rivers murmured by,
A voice from forth the eternal shades,
That spake a present Deity!

And as, upon the sacred page
Thine eye in rapt attention turned
O'er records of a holier age,
Hath not thy heart within thee burned!

It was the voice of God, that spake
In silence to thy silent heart!
And bade each holier thought awake,
And every dream of earth depart.

Voice of our God! O yet be near!
In low sweet accents, whisper peace:
Direct us on our pathway here,
Then bid in Heaven, our wanderings cease!

S. G. BULFINCH.

The coming of Elijah.

A correspondent of Blackwood, thus paraphrases some of the predictions of Malachi.

A sound on the rampart,
A sound at the gate,
I hear the roused lioness
Howl to her mate.
In the thicket at midnight
They roar for their prey,
That shall glut their red jaws
At the rising of day.
For wrath is descending
On Zion's proud tower:
It shall come like a cloud,
It shall wrap like a shroud,
Till like Sodom, she sleeps
In a sulphurous shower.

For behold! the day cometh,
When all shall be flame;
When Zion! the sackcloth
Shall cover thy name:
When thy bark o'er the billows
Of Death shall be driven;
When thy tree by the lightnings
From earth shall be riven,
When the oven, unkindled
By mortal shall burn;
And chaff thou shalt glow
In that furnace of wo;
And, dust as thou wast,
Thou to dust shalt return.

'Tis the darkness of darkness,
The midnight of soul:
No noon on the depths
Of that midnight shall roll.
No starlight shall pierce
Through the life-chilling blaze;
No torch from the roof
Of the temple shall blaze.
But, when Israel is buried
In final despair,
From a height over all,
God of God, Light of Light;
Here the sun shall arise—
Her great Sovereign be there:

Then the sparkles of flame,
From the chariot-wheels hurl'd
Shall smite the crown'd brow
Of the god of this world!
Then captive of ages!
The trumpet shall thrill
From the lips of the seraph,
On Zion's sweet hill.
For, vestured in glory,
Thy monarch shall come.
And from dungeon and cave
Shall ascend the pale slave,
Lost Judah shall rise,
Like the soul from the tomb!

Who pushes from Heaven?
The angel of wrath;
The whirlwind his wing,
And the lightning his path?
His hand is uplifted,
It carries a sword;
'Tis ELIJAH! he heralds
The march of his Lord!
Sun, sink in eclipse!
Earth, earth, shalt thou stand,
When the cherubim wings
Bear the King of thy kings!
Wo, wo, to the ocean,
Wo, wo, to the land!

'Tis the day long foretold,
'Tis the judgement begun;
Gird thy sword, thou most Mighty!
Thy triumph is won.
The idol shall burn
In his own glory shine;
Then, daughter of anguish,
Thy day-spring shall shine!
Proud Zion, thy vale
With the olive shall bloom,
And the mask-rose distill
Its sweet dews on thy hill;
For earth is restored,
The great k gdom come!

Treatment of the Indians by the United States.

"We were born on this spot; our fathers lie buried in it. Shall we say to the bones of our fathers—"Arise and come with us into a foreign land?"—*Speech of a Canadian Indian to the French invaders.*

It was to be hoped that that great republic, the United States of North America, having given so splendid an example of resistance to the injustice of despotism, and of the achievement of freedom in a struggle against a mighty nation calculated to call forth all the generous enthusiasm of brave men, would have given a practical demonstration of true liberty to the whole world: that they would have shewn that it was possible for a republic to exist, which was wise and noble enough to be entirely free: that the sarcasm of Milton should not at least be thrown at them—

License they mean when they cry liberty!

The world, however, was doomed to suffer another disappointment in this instance, and the enemies of freedom to enjoy another triumph. The Americans left that highest place in human legislation, the adoption of the divine precept of doing as they would be done by, as the basis of their constitution, still unoccupied. We had the mortification of seeing the old selfishness which had disgraced every ancient republic, and had furnished such destructive arguments to the foes of mankind, again unblushingly displayed. The Americans proclaimed themselves not noble, not generous, not high-minded enough to give that freedom to others which they had declared, by word and by deed, of the same price as life to themselves. They once more mixed up the old crumbling composition of iron and clay, slavery and freedom, and moulded them into an image of civil policy, which must inevitably fall asunder. They published a new libel on man—in the very moment of his most heroic and magnanimous enthusiasm—shewing him as mean and sordid. While he raised his hand to protest to admiring and huzzaing millions, that there was no value in life without liberty, the manacles prepared for the negroes protruded themselves from his pocket, his impassioned action at once took the air of theatrical rant, and the multitudes who were about to admire, laughed out, or groaned, as they were more or less virtuous. The pompous phrases of "Divine liberty! Glorious liberty! Liberty the birthright of every man that breathes!" became the most bitter and humbling mockery, and gave way to the merry sneer of Matthews—"What! d'ye call it liberty when a man may not larrup his own nigger?"

A more natural tone was assumed as regarded the Indians. They were declared to be free and independent nations; not citizens of the United States, but the original proprietors of the soil, and therefore as purely irresponsible to the laws of the United States as any neighbouring nations. They were treated with, as such, on every occasion: their territories and right of self-government were acknowledged by such treaties.—"There is an abundance of authorities," says Mr. Stuart, in his 'Three Years in North America,' "in opposition to the pretext, that the Indians are not now entitled to live under their own laws and constitutions; but it would be sufficient to refer to the treaties entered into, year after year, between the United States and them as separate nations."

"There two or three authorities, independent of state papers, which most unambiguously prove that it was never supposed that the state governments should have a right to impose their constitution or code of laws upon any of the Indian nations. Thus Mr. Jefferson, in an address to the Cherokees, says—"I wish sincerely you may succeed in your laudable endeavours to save the remnant of your nation by adopting industrious occupations. In this you may always rely on the counsel and assistance of the United States."—In the same way the American negociators at Ghent, among whom were the most eminent American statesmen, Mr. John Quincy Adams and Mr. Henry Clay, in their note addressed to the British Commissioners, dated September 9, 1814, use the following language:—"The Indians residing within the United States are so far independent that they live under their own customs, and not under the laws of the United States." Chancellor Kent, of New-York state (the Lord Coke or Lord Stair of the United States,) has expressly laid it down, that "it would seem idle to contend that the Indians were citizens or subjects of the United States, and not alien and sovereign tribes;" and the Supreme Court of the United States have expressly declared, that "the person who purchases land from the Indians within their territory incorporates himself with them; and, so far as respects the property purchased, holds his title under their protection, *subject to their laws:* if they annul the grant, we know of no tribunal which can revise and set aside the proceeding." Mr. Clay's language is quite decided:—"The Indians residing within the United States are so far independent that they live under their own customs, and not under the laws of the United States; that their rights, where they inhabit or hunt, are secured to them by boundaries defined in amicable treaties between the United States and themselves."—Mr. Wirt, the late Attorney-General of the United States, a man of great legal authority, has stated it to be his opinion, "that the territory of the Cherokees is not within the jurisdiction of the State of Georgia, but within the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the Cherokee nation; and that, consequently, the State of Georgia has no right to extend her laws over that territory."—General Washington in 1790, in a speech to one of the tribes of Indians, not only recognizes the same national independence, but adds many solemn assurances on behalf of the United States.—"The general government only has the power to treat with the Indian nations, and any treaty formed and held without its authority will not be binding.

"Here, then, is the security for the remainder of your lands. No state nor person can purchase your lands, unless by some public treaty held under the authority of the United States.—*The general government will never consent to your being defrauded, but it will protect you in all your just rights.*

"But your great object seems to be the security of your remaining lands, and I have, therefore, upon this point, meant to be sufficiently strong and clear . . . . That, in future, you cannot be defrauded of your lands. That you possess the right to sell, and the right of refusing to sell your lands. . . . That, therefore, the sale of your lands in future will depend entirely upon yourselves. But that, when you find it for your interest to sell any part of your lands, the United States must be present, by their agent, and will be your security that you shall not be defrauded in the bargain you make. . . . . The United States will be true and faithful to their engagements."

These are plain and just declarations; and, had they been faithfully maintained, would have conferred great honour on the United States.—How they have been maintained, all the world knows. The American republicans have followed faithfully, not their own declarations, but the maxims and the practices of their English progenitors. The Indians have been declared savage and irreclaimable. They have been described as inveterately attached to hunting and a roving life, as a stumbling-block in the path of civilization. As perfectly incapable of settling down to the pursuits of agriculture, social arts, and domestic habits. It has been declared necessary, on these grounds, to push them out of the settled territories, and every means has been used to compel them to abandon the lands of their ancestors, and to seek a fresh country in the wilds beyond the Mississippi. Even so respectable an author as Malte Brun has, in Europe, advanced a doctrine in defence of this sweeping system of Indian expatriation. "Even admitting that the use of ardent spirits has deteriorated their habits and thinned their numbers, we cannot suppose that the Indian population was ever more than twice as dense as at present, or that it exceeded one person for each square mile of surface.—Now, in highly civilized countries; like France and England, the population is at the rate of 150 or 200 persons to the square mile. It may safely be affirmed, therefore, that the same extent of land from which one Indian family derives a precarious and wretched subsistence, would support 150 families of civilized men in plenty and comfort. But most of the Indian tribes raise melons, beans, and maize; and were we to take the case of a people who lived entirely by hunting, the disproportion would be still greater. *If God created the earth for the sustenance of mankind, this single consideration decides the question* as to the sacredness of the Indians' title to the lands which they roam over, but do not, in any reasonable sense, occupy."—v. 224.

A more abominable doctrine surely never was broached. It breathes the genuine spirit of the old Spaniard; and, if acted upon, would produce an everlasting confusion. Every nation which is more densely populated than another, may, on this principle, say to that less densely state, you are not as thickly planted as God intended you to be; you amount only to 150 persons to the square mile, we are 200 to the same space;—therefore, please to walk out, and give place to us, who are your superiors, and who more justly fulfil God's intentions by the laws of density.—The Chinese might fairly lay claim to Europe on that ground; and our own swarming poor to every large park and thinly peopled district that they happened to see.

"This single consideration," indeed, is a very good reason why the Indians should be advised to leave off a desultory life, and take to agriculture and the arts; or it is a very sufficient reason why the Europeans should ask leave to live amongst them, and thus more fully occupy the country, in what the French geographer calls a reasonable sense. And it remained for M. Malte Brun to show that they have ever refused to do either the one or the other. They have, on all occasions when the Europeans have gone amongst them, "in a reasonable sense," received them with kindness, and even joy. They have been willing to listen to their instructions, and ready to sell them their lands to live upon. But it has been the "unreasonableness" of the whites that has everywhere soon turned the hearts, and made deaf the ears, of the natives. We have seen the lawless violence which the early settlers seized on the Indians' territories, the lawless violence and cruelty with which they rewarded them evil for good, and pursued them to death, or instigated them to the commission of bloody and desperate deeds. These are the causes why the Indians have remained uncivilized wanderers; why they have refused to listen to the precepts of Christianity; and why they roam over, rather than occupy, those lands on which they have been suffered to remain. From the days of Elliot, Mayhew, Brainard, and their zealous compeers, there have never wanted missionaries to endeavour to civilize and christianize; but they have found, for the most part, their efforts utterly defeated by the wicked and unprincipled character of the Europeans. When the missionaries have preached to the shrewd Indians the genuine doctrines of Christianity, they have immediately been struck with the total discrepancy between these doctrines and the lives and practices of their European professors. "If these are the principles of your religion," they have continually said, "go and preach them to your countrymen. If they had any efficacy in them let us see it shewn upon them. Make them good, just, and full of this love you speak of. Let them regard the rights and property of Indians. You have also a people amongst you that you have torn from their own country, and hold in slavery. Go home and give them freedom, do as your book says,—as you would be done by.—When you have done that, come, again, and we will listen to you."

This is the language which the missionaries have had everywhere in the American forests to contend with.* When they have made by their truly kind and christian spirit and lives some impression, the spirit and lives of their countrymen have again destroyed their labours. The fire-waters, gin, rum, and brandy, have been introduced to intoxicate, and in intoxication to swindle the Indians out of their furs and lands. Numbers of claims to lands have been grounded on drunken bargains, which in their soberness the Indians would not recognize; and the consequences have been bloodshed and forcible expulsion. Before these causes the Indians melted away, or retired westwards before the advancing tide of white emigration. Malte Brun would have us believe that in the United States there never were many more than twice the present number. Let any one look at the list of the different tribes, and their numbers in 1822, quoted by himself from Dr. Morse, and then look at the numbers of all the tribes which inhabited the old States at the period of their settlement.

In New England,	2,247
New-York,	5,184
Ohio,	2,407
Michigan N. W. territories,	28,380
Illinois and Indiana,	17,006
Southern States east of Mississippi,	65,122
West of Mississippi and north of Missouri,	33,150
Between Missouri and Red River,	101,070
Between Red River and Rio del Norte,	45,370
West of Rocky Mountains,	171,200
	471,136

The slightest glance at this table shews instantly the fact, that where the white settlers have been the longest there the Indians have wofully decreased. The farther you go into the Western wilderness the greater the Indian population. Where are the populous tribes that once camped in the woods of New-York, New England, and Pennsylvania? In those states there were twenty years ago about 8000 Indians; since then, a rapid diminution has taken place. In the middle of the seventeenth century, and after several of the tribes were exterminated, and after all had suffered severely, there could not be less, according to the historians of the times, than forty or fifty thousand Indians within the same limits. The traveller occasionally meets with a feeble remnant of these once numerous and powerful tribes, lingering amid the now usurped lands of their country, in the old settled states; but they have lost their ancient spirit and dignity, and more resemble troops of gipsies than the noble savages their ancestors were. A few of the Tuscaroras live near Lewistown, and agriculturists: and the last of the Narragansets, tribe of Miantinomo, are to be found at Charlestown, in Rhode Island, under the notice of the Boston missionaries. Fragments of the Six Nations yet linger in the State of New-York. A few Oneidas live near the lake of that name, now christianized and habituated to the manners of the country.—Some of the Senecas and Conplanters remain about Buffalo, on the Niagara, and at the head-waters of the Alleghany river. Amongst these Senecas, lived till 1830, the famous orator Red-Jacket; one of the most extraordinay men which this singular race has produced. The effect of his eloquence may be imagined from the following passage, to be found in "Buckingham's Miscellanies selected from the Public Journals."

"More than thirty years (this was written about 1822) have rolled away since a treaty was held on the beautiful acclivity that overlooks the Canandaigua Lake. Two days had passed away in negociation with the Indians for the cession of their lands. The contract was supposed to be nearly completed, when Red-Jacket arose.—With the grace and dignity of a Roman senator he drew his blanket around him, and with a piercing eye surveyed the multitude. All was hushed. Nothing interposed to break the silence, save the gentle rustling of the tree-tops under whose shade they were gathered. After a long and solemn, but not unmeaning pause, he commenced his speech in a low voice and sententious style. Rising gradually with the subject, he depicted the primitive simplicity and happiness of his nation, and the wrongs they had sustained from the usurpations of white men, with such a bold but faithful pencil, that every auditor was soon roused to vengeance, or melted into tears. The effect was inexpressible. But ere the emotions of admiration and sympathy had subsided, the white men became alarmed. They were in the heart of an Indian country, surrounded by ten times their number, who were inflamed by the remembrance of their injuries, and excited to indignation by the eloquence of a favorite chief. Appalled and terrified, the white men cast a cheerless gaze upon the hordes around them. A nod from one of the chiefs might be the onset of destruction, but at this portentous moment *Farmers-brother* interposed"

In the year 1805 a council was held at Buffalo, by the chiefs and warriors of the Senecas, at the request of Mr. Cram from Massachusetts.—The missionary first made a speech, in which he told the Indians that he was sent by the Missionary Society of Boston, to instruct them "how to worship the Great Spirit," and not to get away their lands and money; that there was but one true religion, and they were living in darkness, etc. After consultation, Red-Jacket returned, on behalf of the Indians, the following speech, which is deservedly famous, and not only displays the strong intellect of the race, but how vain it was to expect to christianize them, without clear and patient reasoning, and in the face of the crimes and corruptions of the whites.

"*Friend and brother*, it was the will of the Great Spirit that we should meet together this day. He orders all things, and he has given us a fine day for our council. He has taken his garment from before the sun, and caused it to shine with brightness upon us. Our eyes are opened that we see clearly; our ears are unstopped that we have been able to hear distinctly the words that you have spoken. For all these favours we thank the Great Spirit and him only.

"*Brother*, this council-fire was kindled by you. It was at your request that we came together at this time. We have listened with great attention to what you have said; you requested us to speak our minds freely: this gives us great joy, for we now consider that we stand upright before you, and can speak whatever we think. All have heard your voice, and all speak to you as one man; our minds are agreed.

"*Brother*, you say you want an answer to your talk before you leave this place. It is right you should have one, as you are at a great distance from home, and we do not wish to detain you;—but we will first look back a little, and tell you what our fathers have told us, and what we have heard from the white people."

"*Brother, listen to what we say.* There was a time when our forefathers owned this great island. Their seats extended from the rising to the setting sun. The Great Spirit had made it for the use of the Indians. He had created the buffalo, the deer, and other animals for food.—He made the beaver and the bear, and their skins served us for clothing. He had scattered them over the country, and taught us how to take them. He had caused the earth to produce corn for bread. All this he had done for his red children, because he loved them. If we had any disputes about hunting-grounds, they were generally settled without the shedding of much blood; but an evil day came upon us: your forefathers crossed the great waters, and landed on this island.—Their numbers were small; they found friends, and not enemies; they told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men, and came here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat. We took pity on them, granted their request, and they sate down among us. We gave them corn and meat, they gave us poison† in return. The white people had now found out our country, tidings were carried back, and more came amongst us; yet we did not fear them, we took them to be friends: they called us brothers, we believed them, and gave them a larger seat. At length their numbers had greatly increased, they wanted more land,—they wanted our country! Our eyes were opened, and our minds became uneasy. Wars took place; *Indians were hired to fight against Indians*, and many of our people were destroyed. They also brought strong liquors among us; it was strong and powerful, and has slain thousands.

"*Brother*, our seats were once large, and yours were very small. You have now become a great people, and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country, but are not satisfied;—*you want to force your religion upon us.*

"*Brother, continue to listen.* You say that you are sent to instruct us how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his mind, and if we do not take hold of the religion which you white people teach, we shall be unhappy hereafter. You say that you are right, and we are lost; how do you know this? We understand that you religion is written in a book; if it was intended for us as well as for you, why has not the Great Spirit given it to us, and not only to us, why did he not give to our forefathers the knowledge of that book, with the means of understanding it rightly? We only know what you tell us about it; how shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people?

"*Brother*, you say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? why not all agree, as you can all read the book?

"*Brother*, we do not understand these things. We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers, and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion which was given to our forefathers, and has been handed down to us their children. We worship that way. *It teaches us to be thankful for all the favours we receive; to love each other, and to be united;—we never quarrel about religion.*

"*Brother*, the Great Spirit has made us all; but he has made a great difference between his white and red children. He has given us a different complexion, and different customs. To you he has given the arts; to these he has not opened our eyes. We know these things to be true. Since he has made so great a difference between us in other things, why may we not conclude that he has given us a different religion according to our understanding? The Great Spirit does right: he knows what is best for his children: we are satisfied.

"*Brother*, we do not wish to destroy your religion, or take it from you; we only want to enjoy our own.

"*Brother*, you say you have not come to get our land or our money, but to enlighten our minds. I will now tell you that I have been at your meetings, and saw you collecting money from the meeting. I cannot tell what this money was intended for, but suppose it was for your minister; and, if we should conform to your way of thinking, perhaps you may want some from us.

"*Brother*, we are told that you have been preaching to the white people in this place.—These people are our neighbours; we are acquainted with them: we will wait a little while, and see what effect your preaching has upon them. If we find it does them good, makes them honest and less disposed to cheat Indians, we will then consider again what you have said.

"*Brother*, you have now heard our answer to your talk; and this is all we have to say at present. As we are going to part, we will come and take you by the hand, and hope the Great Spirit will protect you on your journey, and return you safe to your friends."

The Missionary, hastily rising from his seat, refused to shake hands with them, saying "there was no fellowship between the religion of God and the works of the devil." The Indians smiled and retired in a peaceful manner.‡ Which of these parties best knew the real nature of religion? At all events the missionary was awfully deficient in the spirit of his own, and in the art of winning men to embrace it.—*Wm. Hewitt.*

* Mr. Mayhew in his journal, writes, that the Indians told him, that they could not observe the benefit of Christianity, because the English cheated them of their lands and goods, and that the use of books made them more cunning in cheating. In his Indian itineraries, he desired of Nimicroft, sachem of the Narragansets, leave to preach to his people.—Nimicroft bid him go and make the English good first, and desired Mr. Mayhew not to hinder him in his concerns.—Some Indians at Albany being asked to go into a meeting-house, declined, saying, "the English went into those places to study how to cheat poor Indians in the price of beaver, for they had often observed that when they came back from those places they offered less money than before they went in."

† Spirituous liquors.

‡ Winterbottom's America.

Our Indian Relations.

NO. II.

The Seminole war evidently sprang out of the peculiar institutions of the South.

The escape of human chattels from their lordly masters, and their finding shelter among savages, was not to be endured. They must be reclaimed at whatever cost.

Oseola's wife, although born and brought up among the Indians, was said to have descended from a slave. She was therefore seized, and carried off by an agent of our Government, and her husband in endeavoring to protect her, was overpowered, *and chained to a log.* He wrenched out the staple—called around him a few daring spirits, and boldly advancing at noon-day up to a garrisoned fort, sought out the author of his wrong, and put him to instant death, while carousing, Belshazzer like, in his tent. Panic seized the soldiers—not a man of the Indians was injured. War followed—and what a war? One hundred of the bravest of the troops, cut off at a blow, without the loss of an Indian. Oseola, captured by the basest treachery! Three hundred Indian prisoners sunk in the rotten hulk of a steamboat! Bloodhounds brought from Cuba, cargo after cargo! Forty millions of dollars expended in this war! And all have failed. But the black catalogue of crime has been still swelling.

The Indians, in retiring into their inmost coverts to plant their corn in peace, where they had hoped the Sun only could find them, were even there pursued, and when fleeing in their canoes, were fired upon and wounded. Then it was that the hounds were called up to be stimulated by the smell of blood, when lo! more humane than their masters, they refused to touch the bleeding victims.

The troops thus abandoned by their new allies, after setting fire to the wigwams and cutting up the corn, retired to their forts triumphant; but the vengeance of a mere handful of men, made desperate, followed them. They were harassed day and night, and *guilt*, that makes cowards of all, left them no resource but to blazon abroad, after every defeat, in large capitals, '*Indian Murders!*' "More Indian Murders!!" Ah! little do they think how the world despises such hypocrisy, such cant!

The world will yet learn more of this history. It may yet be told that one individual knows of about one hundred Indian mothers who have had to destroy or to abandon to perish their own infants, to prevent their cries being heard by the troops.

"Sweet muse of history as thine art
The lamentable scene displays,
I see the workings of thy heart,
I feel the lightning of thy phrase!
Oh hide it, hide it, muse sublime,
Where the keen eye of future time
The dismal record ne'er may find."

We could write a volume on this subject but it is too painful to dwell upon. We turn next to the Cherokees. M.

Imperial-made Fools.—It was well known that during the reign of Peter the First, it was the custom of that tyrant to punish those nobles who offended him, by an imperial order that they should become *fools*; from which moment the unfortunate victim, however endowed with intellect, instantly became the laughing-stock of the whole court. He had the privilege of saying any thing he chose, at the peril, however, of being kicked or horse-whipped, without daring to offer any sort of retaliation; every thing he did was ridiculed, his complaints treated as jests, and his sarcasms sneered at and commented on, as marvelous proofs of understanding in a fool. The Empress Ann suppressed this abominable cruelty, but sometimes mingled in her practices so much oddity that it was impossible not to be entertained. Once she decreed that a certain Prince G. should become a *hen*, to punish him for some trifling misdemeanor; and, for this purpose, she ordered a large basket, stuffed with straw, and hollowed into a nest, with a quantity of eggs inside, to be placed conspicuously in one of the principal rooms at court. The Prince was condemned, on pain of death, to sit upon this nest, and render himself to the last degree ridiculous, by imitating the cackling of a hen.—*Memoirs of the Princess Daschkaw.*

Want of Courtesy.

BY MISS SEDGWICK.

The most striking and prevailing defect in the manners of Americans is, I believe, a want of courtesy. This has probably arisen from the general equality of rights, condition, and education. And it arises in part from that MAUVAISE HONTE, or shyness, characteristic of our English ancestors, from whom we inherit it. A little reflection and moral cultivation would soon remedy this defect. What do I mean by courtesy, and how is the want of it shown, do you ask? A few winters since, a well-bred young foreigner came to the interior, and took lodgings at a village inn, for the purpose of learning the English language. To facilitate its acquisition, he generally preferred remaining in the receiving-room of the tavern where travellers were passing in and out. His writing-table was placed before the fire. When the women came shivering in from a long drive in the stage-coach, he moved his table to the coolest corner of the room, mended the fire, drew chairs near it, and, if they brought in foot-stoves or blocks, he found the best place to heat them. He then returned to his own uncomfortable seat and pursued his writing or reading.

The women profited by his civilities, without appearing to notice them. During the whole winter he never, received one word of acknowledgement—not one 'Thank you, sir,' or 'You are very kind, sir,' or, what would have seemed inevitable, 'Pray, don't take that cold seat, sir.' What was the polished stranger's inference?—Certainly, that the Americans were a most discourteous, if not a cold-hearted people.

Cold-hearted we are not. These women were probably generally impressed with the young man's attentions—one of them I knew, in relating her travelling experience at her own fire side at night, said, she 'never should forget a young man at the tavern in S—. She thought she should have died with the cold before she got there, and when she went in, he moved away from the fire, and gave her the rocking-chair—hung her cloak over the back of another, and warmed her cloak for her, and did every thing just as if he had been her own son!' And yet this good woman had not indicated in her manners to the young man that she even saw him. Here there was no expression of the real feeling, no COURTESY.

I have often seen men in steam-boats, in stage-coaches, and other public meetings, rise and give their seats to women and the women seat themselves quietly, without a look or word of acknowledgment. And so with a thousand other attentions which are rendered, and are received without any return. Avoid such discourtesy, my young friends—it is not only displeasing, but unjust. We actually owe some return for such civilities, and a courteous acceptance is, in most cases, the only one that can be made. These little chance courtesies are smiles on the face of manners, and smiles are like sunshine—we can scarcely have too much of either.

Oliver Cromwell.

"Nearly two hundred years have passed away since Oliver Cromwell ran his conquering career, since the might of the thoughts of his one, solitary brain, changed the fortunes of his party from defeat to triumph; since he—the obscure and struggling brewer of Huntingdon—placed himself on the throne of the Stuarts and the Tudors, and made himself stronger there than any of either name: and the nervous fanatic, dream struck, puritan farmer of St. Ives, took the stricken power and degraded name of England up, and bore them aloft, on the eagle wings of a far sighted and firm hearted statesmanship to an elevation of glory unsurpassed in her illustrious history; yet though the principles nearest his heart have long been identified with European civilization, and the number of their friends is but co-equal with the number of the instructed and the free—though many successive schools and tastes have flourished and died in our literature, and each has poured forth its myriads of biographers, until the student is compelled in our libraries, to wade knee deep in the eulogistic biographies of fribbles—yet have eight generations of his countrymen lived, and scribbled, and enjoyed the sweet fruits of his toils, and Oliver Cromwell—a man crowned in life with the triple success of the warrior, the patriot and the statesman has not to the present hour obtained from any one of those generations or schools the poor oblation of even a single able biographer, either, eulogistic, or friendly or fair. Royalists have written of him—he made them exiles and beggars: Republicans have written of him—he scattered them like chaff; and therefore as the beaten writer of the beater, and the scattered of the scatterer, have the royalists and the republicans written of Oliver Cromwell. To England to Europe, to all time and to the whole earth, he was and ever will be the warrior-apostle of toleration, a doctrine blending the nobleness of free thought with the sweetness of holy charity, which he upheld in debate against the passive obedience of the Prelate, and the uniformity of the Presbyterian, and in battle against the brilliant gallantry of Rupert, and the fiery austerity of Lesly. Toleration has long been a common place with the descendants of his enemies; when will they practice it towards him and his memory?"—*London and Westminister Review October*, 1839.

Wine.

"Oh! thou invisible spirit of wine! if thou has no name to be known by, let us call the—Devil."—*Shakspeare.*

"Wine is said by the poets to be the balm of grief, the dew of beauty, the philter of love.—What that is gracious and graceful, is it not said to be? Clustering grapes entwine the brow of its divinity; and wine is held to be a libation worthy of the gods. Fools! fools! fools! they need to have poured forth their blood and tears like men, to know—that it is a fountain of eternal damnation! Do not fancy that I allude to drunkenness; do not class me, in your imagination, with the sensual brute who degrdes himself to the filthiness of intoxication. Against a vice so flagrant, how easy to arm one's virtue! No: the true danger lies many degrees within that fearful limit; and the Spartans, who warned their sons against wine by the exhibition of their drunken Helots, fulfilled their duty blindly. Drunkenness implies, in fact, an extinction of the very faculties of evil.

The enfeebled arm can deal no mortal blow; the staggering step retards the perpetuation of sin; the voice can neither modulate its tones to seduction, nor hurl the defiance of deadly hatred; the drunkard is an idiot; a thing which children mock at, and women chastise. It is the man whose temperament is excited, not overpowered, by wine, to whom the snare is fatal.

And is it to such a stimulus, that judge and juror recur for strength to inspire their decrees? to such an influence, that captain and helmsman turn for courage in the storm; to such a counsellor, the warrior refers his manœuvres on the day of battle; nay, that the minister, the chancellor, the sovereign himself, dedicate the frailty of their nature! That human life, that human happiness should be subjected to so devilish an instrument! Against all other enemies we fortify ourselves with defence; to this master fiend we open the doors of the citadel."—*Tait's Magazine.*

Modesty.—An ancient poet relates that the flowers once had a grand muster and inspection before Juno, who was to decide which was most beautiful. The violet hid herself among the grass, and did not offer to contend. When the grand procession of beauties were filing along before the Goddess, the violet peeped out furtively saying to herself, "I'll just look at them as they pass." She was seen by the Celestial Queen, and crowned fairest of the fair. Such is the force of modesty.

The Dog.—In the neighborhood of Sparta, a few days ago, a little boy, named Burel, aged about four years, strayed from his home and became lost in the woods, about a mile and a half from his parent's house. The parents became alarmed at the absence of the child and commenced a search, when the family dog was discovered by a black man issuing from the woods. The dog ran to the black man, rubbed himself against him, and used many artifices to attract his attention, in which he so far succeeded as to induce the black man to follow him a mile into the woods, where he found the boy and restored him to his parents.—*Sussex (N. J.) Register.*

Advantages of a Dog.—A letter from the officer commanding the forces that remove the Indians to their western homes, (homes until the whites shall covet them) mentions some of the customs of the red people—among others, the following: Each mess has a little woolly dog, whose back and tongue answers the ordinary purposes of a dish cloth among the whites.—*Phil. U. S. Gaz.*

I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and sweat. This was the reason why our sage and serious poet, Spencer, describing true temperance, under the person of Guion, brings him in with his palmer, through the Cave of Mammon, and the Bower of Earthly Bliss, that he might see and know, and yet abstain.—*Milton.*